# EVOLUTION OF THE WEREWOLF ARCHETYPE FROM OVID TO J. K. ROWLING

A dissertation submitted
to Kent State University in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

Brent A. Stypczynski

December 2008

Dissertation written by
Brent A. Stypczynski
B.A., The College of Wooster, 2000
M.A., Kent State University, 2004
Ph.D., Kent State University, 2008

Approved by

| | |
|---|---|
| D.M. Hassler | Chair, Doctoral Dissertation Committee |
| Susanna Fein | Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee |
| Don-John Dugas | Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee |
| Isolde Thyret | Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee |
| Radd Ehrman | Member, Doctoral Dissertation Committee |

Accepted by

| | |
|---|---|
| Ronald Corthell | Chair, Department of English |
| John R.D. Stalvey | Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements . . . . . iv

Introduction . . . . . 1

Chapter 1: Theological Monster, Chivalric Exemplar . . . . . 26

Chapter 2: Monstrous Anti-Wolf . . . . . 84

Chapter 3: The Disc's K-9 Unit . . . . . .135

Chapter 4: Wolf in Professor's Clothing . . . . . .189

Afterword . . . . . .244

Bibliography . . . . . .252

Acknowledgements

In no particular order, I'd like to thank the committee as a whole for their patience, commentary and assistance in this project. My thanks to Mack Hassler for agreeing to chair this whole thing and his morale support throughout. To Susanna Fein for deploying her editorial experience. To Don-John Dugas for his advice about future work and job hunting. To Isolde Thyret for bringing to bear the historian's perspective that is necessary for a project of this scope.

I'd also like to thank Sara, Mayuri, and Robert for providing therapeutic and relaxing socialization opportunities during the early stages of the process (especially for Kasimir Pulaski/St. Patrick's Day), and for just being there to gripe with. Also Matt, Susie, Danny, and Elizabeth for being such excellent officemates throughout the past couple years and providing helpful insights and opportunities.

Of course, every side of the family deserves credit for their support, interest (even if hearing a bit of babble about werewolves probably got old fast), and memory (of those who are no longer with us to see this). Special thanks to Loki and Hermione for the therapeutic purring, attempts to help type, and their contribution of fur to every draft (even if I should be writing about cats, not dumb wolves).

And especially to my wife, Megan, without whose moral support, Classics experience, and extra pair of editing eyes, this project wouldn't exist in its current form.

# INTRODUCTION

## Introduction

Monsters serve both to mark the fault-lines but also, subversively,
to signal the fragility of such boundaries. (Elaine Graham, 2002)[1]

One of the boundaries that a focus on monstrosity arguably disrupts
is that between past and present. (Bettina Bildhauer and Robert Mills, 2003)[2]

### Neomedieval Werewolves

The study of neomedievalism[3] has recently become important in literary and cultural studies. This approach opens common ground for medievalists, fantasists, and critics of children's literature to study important images and effects. Thus far, the methodology is applied primarily to video games and movies, although some novels and short stories aimed at young audiences have been studied.[4] A key characteristic of this

method is the tension between the old and the new: neomedievalism links two time periods separated by centuries, new technology to old themes and ideas, and modern society to its past (or at least an idealized version of its past). Critical attention has been focused on the modern use of medieval tropes for entertainment value, and familiar arguments have been made about the modern fascination with the idealized medieval. This phenomenon is related to eighteenth-century neo-classicism, since both look to an idealized past for themes and images to draw upon in order to evoke a response from the audience, and this response is one of tonal complexity that becomes increasingly important in my analysis of Terry Pratchett and J. K. Rowling later. Jonathan Swift was particularly skilled in the use of these tonal methods of comparison, and some resonance with such neo-classic effects has been noticed in our time with genre writers such as Pratchett and Rowling. I see examples that parallel some of my work here in recent commentary on the work of Frederik Pohl and Samuel R. Delany where their corpus has been searched for such "doubleness" of tonal effect.[5]

One important image in such discussions is the figure that lacks a stable form, the shape-shifter. If we look at key modern representations of shape-changing characters, we find that they retain strong ties to their medieval forebears and evoke similar responses in the modern audience. Such similarities imply shared social and human concerns, such as where the line between nature and nurture, or between humans and other animals, is drawn. These conclusions become stronger when we note that these figures stretch back at least as far as Ovid and Petronius and have strong associations with pre-historic, totemic beliefs. As Malcolm South notes regarding monsters, "if [a

monster] is to have a profound effect on us, it must reflect something meaningful about human experience and engage our emotions in a powerful way."[6] Moreover, Joyce Salisbury suggests that one reason shape-shifting figures are broadly popular and fascinating is that "[a]nimals do not abide by social expectations that bind humans. They do what they want, go where they want,"[7] especially the wild ones.

Werewolves, and shape-shifters in general, play an intriguing and complex role in the Western literary tradition, a role that has been sufficiently recognized and explored only with regard to the medieval period. Even so, much of the scholarly work on shape-shifting in literature has either focused on the historical, religious, psychological, and medical dimensions, or has been part of wider research regarding the role of monsters. Discussion of shape-changers as literary figures has been minimal, with most scholars more interested in the frames around these characters rather than the figures themselves and their fictive situations. To date, academic discussions of these figures in general, and of werewolves in particular, fall into one of five major positions: the shape-shifter as theological impossibility or monster; the "sympathetic werewolf" as a purely medieval phenomenon; the werewolf as political postcolonial allegory; shape-shifting as a sign or symptom of insanity; or the shape-shifter as social allegory. The shape-shifter warrants attention not only as part of studies in neomedievalism, but also because the representational role is so fundamentally important, even if its "screen time" in a given text is brief.

Saint Augustine presents one of the best discussions of the shape-changer as religious impossibility or monster in *City of God*. In this work Augustine acts as a

commentator, elucidating passages from the Bible, other ancient sources, and current debates of his time regarding a variety of subjects. On the subject of the shape-shifter, he responds in 16.8 to contemporary and ancient Greek tales of "certain monstrous races of man."[8] Generally speaking, his position makes use of simple black-and-white categories based on defining man as both mortal (not an angel) and rational (not an animal). Anything displaying mortality and rational thought, according to Augustine, must be a man, no matter what its outer shape appears to be. This is one of the key passages to which Caroline Walker Bynum refers when she asserts a medieval preoccupation with creating clearly defined borders between species. The end result of this position is that, doctrinally, all stories of such creatures (notably those involving Circe, Lycaon, and the Arcadians) are false, the result of demonic illusion or trickery rather than actual physical change, since the essential nature of the person remains the same (although, in something of a paradox, Augustine does insist that all shape-shifted men retain their rational minds, implying that actual change takes place).

The "sympathetic werewolf" as medieval, psychological phenomenon is best exemplified in Bynum's work, most notably her speech "Metamorphosis, or Gerald and the Werewolf" (1998). Bynum argues that a surface reading of medieval metamorphosis tales leads to discovering a medieval "commitment to species immutability."[9] However, she notes that a more nuanced interpretation of this "fascination with spontaneous generation and hybridization"[10] shows a concern with delimiting animal species-crossing. Many medieval authors wished to understand and control the rules and limits by which species-crossing could take place. Ultimately, Bynum maintains that the "sympathetic"

werewolf is different from modern and ancient ferocious beasts both literarily and figuratively, largely because the medieval versions tend to retain the rational mind, simultaneously glorifying and resisting the idea of metamorphosis (the outer shell changes, but the core humanity remains intact). Bynum's treatment of the "sympathetic" werewolf provides a useful distinction for studies of modern literary shifters even though her exclusive focus on horror films and television limits her own brief foray into the modern era. Bynum also identifies two general types of change: replacement change, where the original form/individual is effectively lost (common in modern horror) and evolutionary change, where the core identity remains largely the same even though the individual undergoes some physical change (common in Ovid, medieval literature, and modern fantasy).[11] Both of these are useful concepts for discussing modern werewolves and other shape-shifters.

The werewolf as postcolonial or political allegory has recently been posited by both Catherine Karkov and S. J. Wiseman.[12] Both scholars add to Bynum's interpretation. Karkov claims that, while Bynum is correct in her discussion of "sympathetic" werewolves, she misses or ignores the political metaphors inherent in Gerald of Wales. Karkov argues that Gerald's story acts as a metaphor for the conquest of Ireland and parallels the partitioning of Ireland. The story and Gerald's *Topographica Hibernica* in general, she claims, make the Irish both attractive, redeemable humans and bestial, monstrous animals, which is perfectly epitomized in the figure of the werewolf. Wiseman works with early modern English texts about the German werewolf Stubbe Peeter (a 1590 trial record) to resolve questions of the soul and politics. She associates

the werewolf with civic discontent by viewing werewolves within a period hierarchy of species and the early modern use of the story in debates regarding civic hierarchies. The werewolf then becomes an allegory for civic monstrosity, namely rebellion. Wisemen notes that Stubbe Peeter has closer ties to Ovid's Lycaon than to Marie de France's Bisclavret in that, like Lycaon, Peeter is characterized as violent, cannibalistic, and deserving of punishment. The shift of influence present in Peeter, from the medieval to the classical, marks a point where the transition between medieval and early modern attitudes toward werewolves begins.

As the early modern period progressed, ideas of self-fashioning, of changing or pretending to change one's essential nature, flourished. This concept is linked to early forays into psychology, which also affect the werewolf figure. Over time, the early psychological view that shape-shifting figures are a sign or symptom of insanity is carried into the twentieth century through psychoanalysis. Although Freud deals with this issue in one of his famous case studies,[13] one of the best discussions of the werewolf as psychosis can be found in Sabine Baring-Gould's *The Book of Werewolves*. Through a mixture of historical overview and collections of folklore, Baring-Gould treats the werewolf as an extinct or semi-extinct creature. He supports the idea that the folkloric/literary phenomena are cases of true shifting, while the non-fictional expressions are psychological illness. Non-fictional figures are, according to Baring-Gould, closely connected to cannibalism, hallucinations, and other expressions of the individual's "natural cruelty"[14]; in other words, lycanthropy is a form of insanity.

Related to this position, in that it considers the psychological implications of the figure, is the view that shape-changers act as allegories for society in general. H. R. Ellis Davidson's research illustrates this position and is a useful contrast to Baring-Gould's in that she sees the Nordic shape-shifters as an integral part of the social structure from whence they come, rather than seeing the shape-shifter as an insane figure that is forced outside of its native society. Notably, Davidson ties commonly appearing forms to animals that are feared (bears, wolves) or useful (cattle, goats). These stories connect (as with some modern iterations) to initiation rites, mythology (tales of Thor and Loki), warbands (the *berserkrs* and *ulfheðnar*), and shamanic practices. As one might expect, the most impressive tales involve wild creatures rather than domesticated ones. Davidson points to several sagas, including *Egil's Saga*, the *Volsunga Saga*, *Landnamabok*, and *Njal's Saga*, in which men become animals, thus displaying the pervasive nature of such fictional beings.

These five critical positions have focused purely on classical/medieval fiction or modern psychoanalysis, leaving modern literary appearances of werewolves unexplored as objects of study, especially at the children's and young adult (YA) levels. To that end, I propose a detailed study of the modern literary werewolf (and, by extension, shape-shifters) in works commonly classified as children's/YA literature, as represented by the authors Pratchett and Rowling, whose combined work initially inspired this research.[15]

Both Pratchett and Rowling continue the medieval "sympathetic" werewolf tradition alongside the early modern tradition of the monstrous wolf. However, neither author works solely within the older traditions. Modern authors have adapted the old

forms both to discuss problems similar to those addressed in earlier literature and to introduce new issues specific to the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. By examining these adaptations, we can see that the shape-shifter exists as an independent archetype which, in its manifestation as the werewolf over the last twenty years, has been put to several evolving functions that build upon, and sometimes subvert, prior traditions.

## The Shape-Shifter and the Jungian Archetype

The literary werewolf operates in a complex environment involving cultural, historical, and psychological elements. The last element includes the shape-shifter archetype. Carl Jung's statement that archetypes are "the contents of the collective unconscious"[16] seems especially appropriate here. Because the figure appears frequently over an extended span of time, it must serve an important purpose or answer one or more important needs. Jung notes that, like Platonic Forms, archetypes are never directly perceived by the conscious mind. Rather, they are modified as they move into the conscious. Therefore representations of the thing, not the thing itself, are seen. The literary realm, and specifically the realm of modern children's and YA literature, is the perfect place to witness such representations at work in various iterations. Although a Freudian perspective is certainly valid and present in the werewolf/shape-shifter—as has

been well demonstrated in critical work focused on Perrault, Webster, and Marie de France—to date the figures have not been approached from an explicitly Jungian perspective. Because they appear in every known culture around the world and throughout history, we should look at the figure from this neglected perspective, especially as an archetype independent of Jung's trickster (the archetype to which he attributes all shape-shifting). That is, shape-shifting plays a more independent role in archetypal terms than Jung considered. Jung conceived of shape-shifting as inextricably linked to the trickster. Hence, all shape-shifting figures must therefore be tricksters. However, an analysis of historical and modern literature in connection with historical documents indicates that the shape-shifter is not necessarily always a trickster but is in fact a separate entity that sometimes overlaps the trickster's function. All tricksters are shape-shifters, but not all shape-shifters are tricksters.

To begin, some definitions are necessary. The most important terms related to this archetype are "werewolf" and "shape-shifter." There are a variety of academic definitions for both terms, such as Kirby Smith's of a "werewolf" as "a person who, either from a gift inborn or from the use of certain magic arts of which he has learned the secret, is in the habit of changing himself into a wolf from time to time."[17] Smith refers to this definition as simply one kind of werewolf, a "constitutional" werewolf. He identifies a second type as "the involuntary werewolf, whose transformation was unavoidable, owing to the curse or charm of some outside power."[18] However, for the purposes of this study, "werewolf" (from the Anglo-Saxon *were-wulf*, literally "man-wolf")[19] will be defined as a figure that can assume the shape of a human and a wolf, yet

is never truly either one. The other major term, "shape-shifter," will be defined as a figure, whether human or otherwise, that is capable of altering its physical appearance without the aid of make-up or prosthetics, sometimes crossing species, gender, and racial boundaries. This alteration can be as minor as changing to give the appearance of age/youth or as major as changing from a man to a bird. For both terms, my working definitions are meant to be as inclusive as possible without being so broad as to be useless.

Based on these definitions, then, the shape-shifter archetype is, at its core, characterized by the ability to change form. Changed form is also the physical manifestation of the shape-shifter's principal psychosocial role: crossing boundaries. This capacity possesses positive and negative attributes. Although crossing boundaries can help society and the individual evolve, it can also cause the social structure and individual psyche to collapse. In both cases, the shape-shifter archetype represents mutability. It stands to reinforce old definitions while simultaneously proposing new ones, and it paradoxically presents stability by means of its very mutability. This ability to cross boundaries and divisions recalls the tension inherent in neomedievalism as well as in neo-classicism, thus making the shape-shifter an ideal representation of the phenomenon. Not only does the archetype represent a tension between time periods, it also crosses the boundaries between genres—fantasy and police procedural (Pratchett); fantasy and mystery (Rowling); fantasy, mystery and modern romance (Laurel K. Hamilton, Stephenie Meyer)—and audiences—as with Rowling's bridging the age gap between children and adults. Genre crossing creates its own tension for readers,

publishers, and booksellers, thereby having the potential to affect the audience's view of these categories and their place in society.

More important in defining the shape-shifter archetype is what the figure does rather than how it appears. Manifestations of this archetype function as civilizing figures, whether by scaring the audience into obedience or by providing an example of good behavior. For earlier agricultural audiences the archetype's fearsome qualities come from the human-to-animal changes, especially when men metamorphose into predatory animals. This particular transformation does not necessarily cause fear in the modern audience, though the close relationship between domestic dogs and wolves, for instance, could be a subconscious source of concern for the modern audience. While the human-to-animal shape-shifter, especially the werewolf, remains a staple of the horror genre, human-to-human[20] or alien-to-human transformations in such works largely replace the human-to-animal as a source of fear and uncertainty. The former types act through displaying instability and hybridity where we seek solidity. The human-to-human or alien-to-human shifter exposes the façade that exists in most human relations, that which maintains the divide between public and private persona.

The shape-shifter also serves as a reminder of humanity's past and bestial nature, largely in the form of human-to-animal shifts, which evoke a fear of the supernatural or potentially uncomfortable reminders of our close connection to the animal world. At the same time, these manifestations provide a sense of connectedness with nature and open up the nature-versus-nurture debate. For example, Marie de France's Bisclavret and *William of Palerne's* Alphouns exemplify nurture winning out, while Rowling's Fenrir

Greyback exemplifies nature triumphant. Jeffery Jerome Cohen notes that shifters "are disturbing hybrids whose externally incoherent bodies resist attempts to include them in any systematic structuration,"[21] and who almost always escape to the unclassified margins of society. Although Cohen is discussing monsters in general, his observation is especially apt for this archetype because the more we try to classify types of shifters (or archetypes), the more they adapt to evade those very categories.

In this way, the shape-shifter is related to the trickster archetype described by Jung, who identifies shape-shifting as one of the trickster's traits. Like the trickster, the shape-shifter is both human and bestial and therefore shares an affinity with the part of the psyche that Jung calls the shadow. That said, the shape-shifter does not have to be bestial; it can be a supernatural magician like Malory's Merlyn and Spenser's Archimago. The shape-shifter is independent of the trickster in that it does not normally, or solely, work through the application of pranks, as is often the case with the Native American Coyote or Norse Loki. Rather, most shape-shifting figures come from a standard set of possibilities: 1) they are the victims of other characters' cruelty; 2) they exist because of aid from a demon; or 3) they are ethically neutral agents with little concern for society or humanity. Although the trickster almost always incorporates a lesson, whether explicit or implicit, in his/her story, this is not necessarily the case with the shape-shifter. In many cases, the shape-shifter is used simply to instill fear, either of the unknown or of the bestial side of the audience.

The shape-shifter is related to the trickster in that they are both agents of change. In archetypal terms, the shape-shifter reminds us that mutability, both replacement and

evolution, is a constant in life. Depending on its manifestation, the shape-shifter, especially as the werewolf, can represent social or political change (as is the case with Marie's Bisclavret), biological evolution (as with Jack Williamson's werewolves[22] or Hal Clement's alien shape-shifters[23]), or psychological change (John Webster's Ferdinand or Rowling's Remus Lupin). In every manifestation, the shape-shifter acts to herald, to cause, or to draw attention to the moment of alteration. How the individual reacts to the shifter's appearance and message—with fear, excitement, or trepidation, for example—determines how the person responds to the mutability the figure represents.

The proposed archetype also has a variety of other traits, some of which it shares with representations of monsters in general. Shape-changers act to justify categories and categorizations even as they work to break such classifications. They appear as signs of a constantly mutable world that changes socially, physically, and individually (on the part of its inhabitants). As David Gilmore notes, they work to "expose the radical permeability and artificiality of all our classificatory boundaries, highlighting the arbitrariness and fragility of culture."[24] This fragility appears in many forms. For instance, according to Michael Cheilik, cannibalism (an artificial boundary between the civilized and the wild) is a key trait that appears in many tales involving the shape-shifter archetype, in part because the shape-shifter develops in its earliest form at an evolutionary transition point between semi-vegetarian apes and carnivorous apes.[25] Tied into the construction of the archetype is the fact that, according to Irving Massey, at least in the medieval period if not today, "[m]etamorphosis [. . .] is about a reconciliation [. . .] of the damned with the divine," the illogical animal with the reasoning human.[26] That is,

metamorphosis is about achieving the balance between the falling angel and the rising ape, to paraphrase Pratchett's suggestion. As with most subjects of literary criticism, the archetype also has transgressive erotic undertones, especially when it appears in werewolf stories and sixteenth-century witchcraft trials—with witches turning into cats to enter their victims' bedrooms—but then, to paraphrase Massey, what has not been given such connections? That is to say, erotic connotations are certainly not unique to the shape-shifter.

However, building out of the erotic connotations, we can see that the proposed archetype is interested in beginnings, birth, and re-birth, much like the multi-morphic Shiva and Durga of Hindu theology. Shape-shifters act upon their socially transgressive impulses, thereby providing a vicarious psychological release. These impulses include wildness, violence, nudity taboos, bestiality (in both senses of the term), social bonds (medieval representations are commonly associated with marriage), adultery, and rape. In this way, the theriomorph (human-animal shifter) also functions to separate humanity from excessive violence, as in the cases of rape and multiple murders present in the trials of Jean Grenier and Stubbe Peeter. By blaming the transgressive violence and sex on the beast, the human part of the individual is absolved even as it is punished. This role as psychological release valve brings the archetype into a closer relationship with the shadow, that part of the psyche made up of all the socially transgressive impulses. The shape-shifter archetype allows the shadow to be vicariously exercised, thereby aiding the individual to come to terms with the shadow and maintaining the social structure by releasing some of the pressure created by the collective shadow.

Within this rather broad characterization are many potential categories for the archetype's manifestations. Among the most important and common of these are: human-to-human (Malory's Merlyn), human-to-animal (Marie de France's Bisclavret), non-human (Shakespeare's Puck, also a trickster, who uses an inherent talent), magical transformations (Spenser's Archimago, who uses spells), and cursed shifters (Alphouns in *William of Palerne*). The human-to-human, non-human, and magical shifters share the most traits with Jung's trickster. Many use their abilities to fool and play pranks on those around them, some more benignly than others (Puck is more benign than Archimago). The human-to-animal figures (the focus of this study) and the cursed ones tend to draw the shape-shifter away from the trickster into an archetype of its own because in many cases they are more interested in removing their curse or recovering their lost human shape than in trickery or changing society. This is not to say that they do not make use of trickery to achieve their goals, but rather that their goals and those of the Jungian trickster are not generally the same.

Among cursed and human-to-animal shifters, the most common in the English and European literary traditions is the werewolf. In one form or another, werewolves are a presence in European literary history, from their earliest appearances in Petronius' *Satyricon* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. This manifestation of the shape-shifter continues through the Middle Ages, in the works of Gerald of Wales and Marie de France among others, to subtly inhabit the early modern period, as evidenced by John Webster's and Charles Perrault's works. Moreover, they litter the modern literary landscape from

Stephen King to Rowling, as Charlotte Otten has partially shown in her anthology *The Literary Werewolf*.

The werewolf manifestation appears in virtually every Western culture, in both the New and Old Worlds. This intercultural appearance makes the werewolf much more common as an iteration of the shape-shifter than any of its cousins. Other appearances, including werecows and werebears, werejaguars, weretigers, and selkies, are limited to specific geographic regions (Scandinavia, Central/South America, India, and the British Isles, respectively). Only the werewolf appears to move throughout most world cultures without regard to national or cultural boundaries. The werebear is a close second, appearing in some North American stories as well as Scandinavian and Russian tales. This prevalence of the werewolf is probably due in large part to the fact that wolves of one breed or another were once common to every region. Since wolves prey on domestic animals, there is a nearly universal fear of the wolf in agricultural societies throughout history. Because it is such a widely spread figure, the werewolf is also the most widely varied manifestation of the shape-shifter in its traits, in audience responses, and in how authors employ the figure.

## Methods of "Taming" the Wolf

With the proposed archetype in mind, the focal point of my research is the werewolf. In order to best discuss the subject, this study will begin with early appearances of the werewolf and move forward into the modern era. This organization—medieval to early modern to modern—has been chosen because monsters and related figures are, as Cohen has pointed out, "an embodiment of a certain cultural moment."[27] Since they grow from the fears and beliefs of a given temporal and social instant, they are inextricably tied to a variety of social, literary, historical, and cultural relationships. Due to these relationships, which link the figure to "forbidden practices, in order to normalize and enforce" cultural rules, the monster becomes attractive because it does that which is forbidden.[28]

The initial chapter, "Theological Monster, Chivalric Exemplar," constructs and supports the tradition of the sympathetic werewolf in the medieval period as it evolves from the Ovidian tradition of animal transformation used as divine punishment as evidenced in *Metamorphoses*. I explore this tradition by building on the work of Bynum and Karkov, with examinations of Saint Augustine, Albert the Great, Marie de France, *William of Palerne*, *Arthur and Gorlagon*, and Gerald of Wales. Because each author makes use of the figure in different ways, the chapter travels from the classical influence of Ovid to uses of the werewolf that are religious (Augustinian, Albert), literary (Marie, *Arthur*, and *William*), and socio-political (Gerald and Marie). The shape-shifter

archetype, appearing as the werewolf, acts as an agent of social construction/reflection in order to mold and reflect wider cultural issues. In each case, because the werewolves in question act as agents of social change, they are simultaneously feared and welcomed by the audience. The sympathetic nature of the medieval tradition's werewolf was thus more highly threatening to the social order than the original, classical monster or punishment tradition for several reasons. Initially, the three major examples—Bisclavret, Alphouns, and Gerald's wolf couple—are all polished courtiers and/or religiously orthodox, making them threats to the socio-religious order on account of their masquerading ability. Moreover, as with any symbol, if the figure evokes sympathy, it becomes more difficult to demonize and make "other" than if it is initially viewed in a negative or neutral light. This sympathizing makes the werewolf a difficult creature to deal with, as one might expect from a figure that holds no immutable shape, yet the sympathetic nature of these werewolves is useful in terms of "othering" outsiders and (re-)constructing society through allegory. However, none of these figures overtly exhibits the traits of true wolves, nor do they exhibit fully human traits, yet they display idealized characteristics. They are loners, for example, although they display community-building behaviors. Nearly all lack the capacity for speech while in their animal form, and Bisclavret is described as a model knight and liegeman, even while trapped in his wolf shape

Tracking the change from this iteration of the werewolf, the next chapter, "Monstrous Anti-Wolf," follows early modern modifications of the figure, as distinct from medieval views, focusing on the monstrous side as the sympathetic portrayal of the

werewolf virtually disappears. In this period, the figure becomes fully divorced from the true wolf in that its actions are typically anti-social rather than community building. During the period 1500-1700, the literary werewolf vanishes, as the physically shifting man-wolf largely disappears (save for faeries). Instead, the werewolf appears more subtly in the allegorical and psychological senses, typified by Webster's Ferdinand. Another notable example is Perrault's charismatic and eloquent monstrous wolf, a new form of the figure that both returns to the classical model and adds a new dimension—speech—that was previously found only rarely (perhaps only in Gerald of Wales), while building on the medieval trope of the rational animal—a man's mind in a wolf's body. This trait of speech indicates an early modern polish on the medieval character, which ties the figure to the process of self-fashioning noted later. Using this background, I discuss lycanthropy as (psychological) disease (Webster) and the early modern suave wolf/predator (Perrault). The discussion is informed by the simultaneously attractive and feared influence of Italian culture and literature upon English society during the periods discussed, through the use of Castiglione and Machiavelli and their roles in the self-fashioning process. Generally speaking, early modern werewolves are not sympathetic, as were their predecessors, but they are monstrous on at least one, and sometimes multiple, levels (social, political, psychological, transgressively violent/sexual, and/or theological). Through these appearances, the figure retains the paradox that is essential to its nature in that while there are few, if any, positive werewolf images in early modern Europe, they still have a place in enacting the morally neutral self-fashioning process.

Perrault segues into "The Disc's K-9 Unit," a close reading of Pratchett's Constable Angua through the lens of these earlier tropes because of Pratchett's fascination with fairy tales, their origins and their logical extensions. One reason for choosing Pratchett as a subject of study is the growing recognition of his literary merit over the last decade, with scholars discussing his approach to a variety of topics from gender and sexuality to satire and humor. As with all good satirists, Pratchett mocks the very traditions he uses, yet retains a serious subtext that examines myriad aspects of society. In order to explore this aspect of his work and the werewolf figure, the chapter focuses on *The Fifth Elephant* and *Thud!*, two novels in which Constable/Sergeant Angua plays a major role.

In this chapter, I explain, through Pratchett's subtext, the continued popularity of the medieval tradition (as edited by the early modern period) in the modern era and discuss the adaptations that the werewolf undergoes through Pratchett's system of modernization. As part of this process, various early modern elements (e.g., the transgressively sexual tradition) go into remission while others (e.g. community building) are reintroduced. In this case, the latter comes about through Angua's role as a member of the Ankh-Morpork Watch and her relations with her co-workers. She also serves as a reminder that dogs are simply wolves that have chosen to live with man. Additionally, Pratchett notes that this character is the exception to the rule (as she at least attempts to restrain her bestial side), as with Lupin below, yielding both serious and comedic implications, both of which are important in Pratchett's writing.

Although Pratchett's werewolves are fundamentally medieval, they are more complex as more versions and signifiers come into play. This increased complexity weaves into the nature of the figure as a symbol of change and flux, and should be expected given that it is a mutable being capable of physical metamorphosis. For example, through Angua, the werewolf is presented grappling with such social issues as racism, job discrimination, and the nature-versus-nurture debate. Her occupation as a police officer has implications regarding mutability and order that do not arise in the same way with Rowling's Lupin, who operates in education, directly shaping and working with developing minds in a relatively small and private setting rather than being publicly visible to a large population.

Chapter four, "Wolf in Professor's Clothing," focuses on exactly these differences, the layers that Rowling adds to the neomedieval werewolf by both building on and becoming parallel to Pratchett's layers. This sort of multiplicity of layering ought to be expected from Rowling as an extension of the multi-layered effect that is characteristic of her writing: elements drawn from older sources aimed at adults, and elements pulled from the fairy tale/folklore tradition targeted toward the younger audience. The quantity and quality of narrative layering is also what has drawn a number of scholars to take critical, literary and socio-historical approaches to her work.[29] As is the case with Pratchett, Rowling's use and adaptation of her predecessors calls for critical study on its own and presents a strong case for her work's literary merit. Part of this merit comes from the fact that her primary werewolf, Remus Lupin, is the best modern example of the neomedieval werewolf. Lupin is clearly constructed from a medieval

mold found in Marie de France's "Bisclavret" and *William of Palerne*. That said, Rowling strays in several important ways from earlier traditions, notably that Lupin retains his friends after they discover his "condition" and that a love interest enters, rather than flees, because of his morphic ability.

This chapter focuses on *Prisoner of Azkaban* (Lupin's first appearance), *Order of the Phoenix* (where Lupin undergoes important character development and Fenrir Greyback is first discussed), *Half-Blood Prince* (in which Lupin's background is further developed along with Rowling's conception of werewolves in general and Greyback makes his first appearance), and *Deathly Hallows* (where Lupin's character develops and his son is briefly discussed). As with many medieval werewolf figures, notably Bisclavret and Alphouns, Lupin acts to socialize other characters. However, he moves beyond this role. In terms of socialization, Lupin as teacher and sign of authority directly instructs younger generations. He also serves as a mentor and instructs others in civility through his example (a clear tie both to Bisclavret/Alphouns and to Castiglione). Additionally, he provides another layer of mystery for the writer to use in that his own secretiveness about his condition becomes a red herring in the plot. The character further evokes racism beyond the obvious Muggle-Wizard level. As with most werewolves, Lupin quickly calls attention to the nature-versus-nurture debate, but he also draws upon the role of friendship (both for the younger characters/readers and himself). Lupin takes what Castiglione did for the elite in 1510 and makes it public in a modern world. Even though his fictional "public" is technically a hidden elite, the readers are certainly too varied in background, ethnicity, and age to be either hidden or elite. Balancing the

monstrous tendencies with his sympathetic and courtly qualities creates the dynamic that is key to both Rowling's writing and to Lupin's brand of self-fashioning, which he transmits to Harry in several scenes. This role fulfills one purpose of metamorphosis, as the act becomes, in Leonard Barkan's words, "a means of creating self-consciousness because it establishes a tension between identity and form" and causes the changed individual to look closely at himself.[30]

Finally, I need to comment briefly on my choice of Pratchett and Rowling as focal authors when it is clear that in the rather large range of popular writing involving the archetype some texts do focus more centrally on the werewolf, such as Jack Williamson's *Darker Than You Think* (1948), Tanith Lee's *Lycanthia* (1990), and Charles de Lint's *Wolf Moon* (1988). But Pratchett's werewolves are central as part of an ensemble cast of characters while Rowling's, like *William of Palerne's* Alphouns, becomes focal by providing necessary plot information and assistance. In both cases, the werewolves are an important aspect of the authors' greater discussion of shape-shifting in general. Thus I am arguing for the presence of the proposed shape-shifter/werewolf archetype. The archetype is, simply, a figure that can change forms. It thereby represents a crossing of boundaries. It serves to question and reify the social structures that police transgressive acts, and it provides a vicarious psychological release valve for the shadow. In order to establish this figure as an archetype, I will present a tradition of manifestations and functions that reflect the psycho-social concerns of the cultures in which they appear. I hope to demonstrate that the proposed archetype has adapted to remain relevant to the modern psyche and society.

[1] Elaine L. Graham, *Representations of the Post/Human: Monsters, Aliens and Others in Popular Culture* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2002) 12.
[2] Bettina Bildhauer and Robert Mills, "Introduction: Conceptualizing the Monstrous," *The Monstrous Middle Ages*, eds. Bettina Bildhauer and Robert Mills (University of Toronto Press, 2003) 5.
[3] As coined by Umberto Eco in 1973 and defined, for the purposes of this study, as the intersection of popular fantasy and medieval history, or interest in medieval themes in popular culture.
[4] See Daniel Kline and Carol Robinson, *The Medieval in Motion: Neomedievalism in Film, Television, and Video Games,* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2008); N. Katherine Hayles, "The Complexities of Seriation," *PMLA* 117.1 (Jan 2002): 117-121; and Angela Jane Weisl, "Medieval Studies and Popular Culture," *Medieval Academy News* (Winter 2003).
[5] Donald M. Hassler, "Swift, Pohl, and Kornbluth: Publicists Anatomize Newness," *Political Science Fiction*, ed. Donald M. Hassler and Clyde Wilcox (University of Southern California Press, 1997): 18-25; Gregory E. Routledge, "Science Fiction and the Black Power/Arts Movements: The Transpositional Cosmology of Samuel R. Delany, Jr." *Extrapolation* 41.2 (Summer 2000): 127-142. See also James Sutherland, *English Literature of the Late Seventeenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969).
[6] Malcolm South, "Introduction," *Mythical and Fabulous Creatures: A Source Book and Research Guide*, ed. Malcolm South (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987) xx.
[7] Joyce E. Salisbury, *The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages,* (New York: Routledge, 1994) 5.
[8] Saint Augustine, *The City of God*, trans. Marcus Dods (New York: The Modern Library, 1993).
[9] Caroline Walker Bynum, "Metamorphosis, or Gerald and the Werewolf," *Metamorphosis and Identity*, ed. Caroline Bynum (New York: Zone Books, 2005) 82.
[10] Ibid. 82.
[11] Caroline Walker Bynum, "Introduction," *Metamorphosis and Identity*, ed. Caroline Walker Bynum (New York: Zone Books, 2005) 20.
[12] In S. J. Wiseman, "Hairy on the Inside: Metamorphosis and Civility in English Werewolf Texts," *Renaissance Beasts*, ed. Erica Fudge (Urbana, IL: U of Illinois P, 2004) 70-86. and Catherine Karkov, "Tales of the Ancients: Colonial Werewolves and the Mapping of Postcolonial Ireland," *Postcolonial Moves: Medieval Through Modern*, eds. Patricia Clare Ingham and Michelle R. Warren (New York: Macmillan, 2003) 93-109.
[13] Sigmund Freud, *The Wolf-Man and Other Cases*, trans. Louise Adey Huish (New York: Penguin Classics, 2003).
[14] Sabine Baring-Gould, *The Book of Were-Wolves: Being an Account of a Terrible Superstition* (New York: Causeway Books, 1973) 7.
[15] These two authors have been chosen as opposite ends of the spectrum: Pratchett, while popular around the world, is still marginalized in the U.S. with a relatively small fan base (despite a career spanning more than forty years). Rowling, on the other hand, is embraced worldwide save only by the margins, after a mere decade.
[16] Carl G. Jung, *Four Archetypes: Mother/Rebirth/Spirit/Trickster* (Princeton UP, 1992) 4.
[17] Kirby Smith, "An Historical Study of the Werwolf in Literature," *PMLA* 9 (1894): 4.
[18] Ibid. 5.

[19] Archbishop Wulfstan of York may have been the first to use the term in 1008. Although he did not coin the term, as he drew upon oral Saxon/Celtic tradition, he certainly made the term popular.
[20] Two notable non-horror examples are Thomas Malory's Merlin (who adopts several guises ranging from appearing as a young child to an aged man) and Edmund Spenser's Archimago (who also adopts several human guises through magic).
[21] Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)," *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (University of Minnesota Press, 1996) 6.
[22] Jack Williamson, *Darker Than You Think* (New York: Berkley Medallion Books, 1969).
[23] Hal Clement, *Cycle of Fire* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1981).
[24] David D. Gilmore, *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003) 19.
[25] Michael Cheilik, "The Werewolf," *Mythical and Fabulous Creatures: A Source Book and Research Guide*, ed. Malcolm South (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987) 275.
[26] Irving Massey, *The Gaping Pig: Literature and Metamorphosis* (University of California Press, 1976) 195.
[27] Cohen 4.
[28] Ibid. 16.
[29] See Cynthia Whitney Hallet's *Scholarly Studies in Harry Potter* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2006) and Heather Arden and Kathryn Lorenz's "The Harry Potter Stories and French Arthurian Romance," *Arthuriana* 13.2 (2003): 54-68 among others.
[30] Leonard Barkan, *The Gods Made Flesh* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1986) 46.

# CHAPTER 1

## Theological Monster, Chivalric Exemplar

> [Shape-shifting] suggests, terrifyingly, that the boundaries of natural form are insecure, that it is somehow possible for a self to slip out of the protective clothing that declares its identity and become trapped in a shape that misidentifies and misrepresents it. (David Williams, 1999)[1]

### Medieval Monsters

The medieval period has a greater variety of theories and perspectives regarding werewolves than any other pre-modern era. This multiplicity of interpretations, already growing from the Roman period, explodes in the twelfth century as thoughts about werewolves enter Anglo-Norman courtly literature from many sources, including Breton *lais*, romances, and theological travel narratives. Much of the work involved in reconstructing these traditions owes a debt to current discussions of monster theory. That

is, as Jeffery Jerome Cohen points out, "monstrous interpretation is as much a process as epiphany, a work that must content itself with fragments."[2] Although this is certainly true of research involving monsters, it is even more valid when we look at extant tales of werewolves, many of which mention the creatures only briefly or leave more questions than they answer.

Roman traditions continued into the late medieval period, largely through Ovid and his conception of the monstrous werewolf cursed by the gods. In Caroline Walker Bynum's words, the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were "the years of the revival of Ovid, of marvel-collecting, of theological exploration of shape-shifting and body-borrowing, of new kinds of transformation miracles and alchemy."[3] The Ovidian tradition, far from remaining stable, was influenced and modified by the medieval perception of normal wolves, as indicated by a variety of bestiaries (Albert the Great and Isidore of Seville) and folktales (largely oral in nature, but referenced by Marie de France, for instance). In addition to this perspective, we see the growth of an ecclesiastical tradition, with Saint Augustine as its foundation, that simultaneously indicates a disbelief in species transformation and refers to all such occurrences as mere illusions perpetrated by demons. Such discussions continued into the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Even as later discussions of the theological possibility of species change were circulating in Church circles, the werewolf archetype entered the realm of courtly literature when poets used it to discuss human nature, thereby creating the so-called sympathetic werewolf. At the same time they were also being used in the twelfth-century as exemplars to build or alter society as a whole. The use of the archetype to

produce exemplars appears specifically in *Bisclavret*, *William of Palerne*, and *Arthur and Gorlagon,* in which the werewolves perform as upstanding, morally positive figures, especially when compared to their wives (or stepmother).

## Lycaon's Get

Although legends about werewolves go back as far as *Gilgamesh* or ancient Greece,[4] the earliest solid literary and historical werewolf stories come from ancient Rome. For instance, Pausanias relates a note that "With respect to the Parrhasian pugilist from Arcadia, whose name is Demarchus, all that is related of him, except his Olympic victory, I consider as the fictions of arrogant men; such as, for instance, that in a sacrifice to Lycaean Jupiter he changed himself into a wolf, and in the tenth year after this recovered again his pristine form."[5] This period introduces several key points of the werewolf legend, including: the removal of clothing before transforming; the connection between werewolves and graveyards; and the monstrous nature of werewolves, especially in the works of Petronius and Ovid. Livy adds Roman street slang referring to a prostitute as a *lupa* (she-wolf), with connotations regarding the foster mother of Romulus and Remus.[6] Virgil further states, as Alphesiboeus, that "These herbs and these poisons, culled in Pontus, Moeris himself gave me – they grow plenteously in Pontus. By their aid

I have oft seen Moeris turn wolf and hide in the woods, oft call spirits from the depth of the grave, and charm sown corn away to other fields."[7] A clearer case can be found in mythological and literary texts, specifically in those of Petronius and Ovid. Petronius' tale is told by the former slave Niceros to his friend and host Trimalchio in *Satyricon*.[8] In brief, Niceros decides to see his lover while his master is out of town. Since he travels at night, he takes a companion with him. Part of the way along the trip, his companion falls behind and enters a graveyard. There, Niceros watches the other man strip off his clothing and turn into a wolf. Being prudent, Niceros flees soon after, and thus lives to tell his tale to Trimalchio.

Ovid's story, about Jupiter's punishment of King Lycaon the Arcadian, shares some similar points, in that the connection this story creates between werewolves and cannibalism is clear, as is the idea of the human consciousness trapped in the animal body, since, according to Ovid, "he is still Lycaon." However, Ovid's account involves divine agency and Lycaon lacks the ability to resume his human form. Ovid's story is that Lycaon is visited by Jupiter. While his people fall over themselves to worship the god in disguise, Lycaon refuses to believe in his divinity. To prove to the Arcadians that the disguised Jupier is not a god, Lycaon secretly orders a human prisoner to be killed, cooked, and served to the god as dinner. This rendition of a human sacrifice offends the Olympian, who strikes the palace with lightning and curses his host. The god later tells his fellow deities that Lycaon:

> fled in terror, reached the silent fields,
>
> And howled, and tried to speak. No use at all!

Foam dripped from his mouth; bloodthirsty still, he turned
Against the sheep, delighting still in slaughter,
And his arms were legs, and his robes were shaggy hair,
Yet he is still Lycaon, the same greyness,
The same fierce face, the same red eyes, a picture
Of bestial savagery.[9]

This event, according to Ovid, happens just before the gods send a flood to wipe the earth clean and restart the race of mortals.

Jupiter's transformation of Lycaon into a wolf fits the pattern present throughout Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* for a careful collation of Ovid's transformation stories reveals that, in the majority of cases, the Roman gods use human-to-animal transformation as a punishment, while human-to-plant metamorphosis is more commonly used as a reward or form of aid. Without stating the pattern in these words, Harold Skulsky theorizes that transformations in Ovid sometimes appear as a form of death, that is, as the transformation occurs, the person dies and the animal is born.[10] However, he also notes that this theory has its exceptions in that there are times when the mind or spirit remains, as is the case with Callisto, Actaeon, and Lycaon. Leonard Barkan also posits this theory as he notes, "Metamorphosis is as much a beginning as an end"[11] in Ovid. Barkan further alludes to the punishment-reward pattern when he states, "animal [. . .] metamorphosis is liable to capture a particularly base element in the formerly human personality,"[12] usually lust, pride, jealousy, or greed. On the other hand, metamorphoses into plants figure the

higher emotions, such as love (the most common underlying motive for a plant transformation in Ovid).

Skulsky posits the additional theory that "the fantasy of transformation, in Ovid's treatment, is the story of the self as it endures a catastrophic physical change."[13] Based on this evaluation, Lycaon appears to succeed because, as Jupiter says, "he is still Lycaon." That is, he adapted to his new shape and new life because, while his body has changed, his core personality remained the same. Alternatively, we can argue that his outer form is changed by Jupiter to match his inner self. If so, the idea that Lycaon undergoes a "catastrophic change" becomes problematic, since the transformation is actually to a more appropriate outer shape, with no more than a moment of adaptation necessary to deal with the change. However, this treatment, as identified by Skulsky, is clearly different from Petronius' use of the motif. In the case of Niceros' companion, the change undertaken does not involve overt divine agency, but is done at the will of the werewolf. The soldier has apparently already adapted, and the change, while horrific, is not exactly catastrophic.

Many Ovidian theories eventually make their way into the medieval appropriation of metamorphosis through both theological and secular writers. According to Barkan, as part of this appropriation, theological writers take up the concept that "[h]uman nature and society recognize categories of order just as does the physical world: to misunderstand or to skew these categories is to invite moral chaos."[14] The idea of species transformation causing moral decline is a major aspect of early Christian writing on lycanthropy, as will be discussed later. Likewise, both theologians and early naturalists

such as Albertus Magnus, Isidore of Seville, and Augustine believed that an object's or animal's nature (and thus its morality) could be determined by looking at its shape. Because shape equals nature, an animal produces other animals that look just like it—the early scientific adage that like produces like. Thus, the introduction of metamorphic form becomes a threat of what could happen without the social structure. However, according to Barkan, secular authors such as Marie De France and the anonymous authors of *William of Palerne* and *Arthur and Gorlagon* were drawn to the Ovidian belief that "[i]f things turn into other things, then so do individuals, concepts, rules, emotions,"[15] that is, if people can be turned into animals or plants, whether divine agency is involved or not, then society, people, and ideas can change as well, with less effort. Despite these interpretations, the Ovidian werewolf was, at its core, a monstrous, cannibalistic figure given to bloodthirst and ferocity.

Appropriations of Ovid continue in the cannibalistic characterizations that appear in the medieval period, during which religious writers commonly interpreted Ovid's and other shape-shifter stories allegorically, adding moral lessons to turn cannibalism and other traits into moral metaphors based on division and the avoidance of hybridity. The classical view, identified by Joyce Salisbury, that "[t]here was so little distinction between humans and animals that half-human/half-animal births were unremarkable, and the gods could appear as animals without diminishing their power and stature,"[16] disappears in twelfth- and fourteenth-century moral appropriations of Ovid. One reason that this shift occurs involves medieval theological concerns regarding bestiality and the maintenance of a doctrinal separation between humans and other animals. A leading

theory, as will be discussed in greater detail with Gerald of Wales, was that human-animal hybrids were the result of bestiality, thus prompting myriad Christian laws against such acts. Thus Cohen: "The monster of prohibition exists to demarcate the bonds that hold together that system of relations we call culture, to call horrid attention to the borders that cannot–*must* not–be crossed."[17] In this case, the doctrinal border between man and the beasts is laid out in the Book of Genesis. As knowledge of the natural world increases, simplistic binary thinking–man/beast–turns into a continuum, so the point of difference has to be moved from the physical to the mental, and then to the spiritual. Otherwise, the entire system comes crashing down because the presence of a dividing line, the idea that man is different from other animals, is at the core of Christian doctrine. According to Genesis, man was created in God's image (therefore capable of salvation) and given dominion over other animals.

In order to help maintain the binary, as Daniel Javitch has explained, "Ovid's account is usually altered by omitting any aspect which cannot be made to fit the predetermined significance"[18] selected by the monastic copyists. Through such changes, ecclesiastical authors undertook what damage control they could to minimize Ovid's impact. Responses on the part of Church writers ranged from denouncing the classical gods as mere demons providing illusory transformation to completely denying the possibility of metamorphosis, calling it a purely fictive element. A significant contingent of ninth- to twelfth-century Church authorities were concerned about the popularity of belief or interest in metamorphosis and several local attempts to ban these beliefs were made on the part of Church leaders (usually with only a mild penance). Jeffry Massey

claims that "Everyone believed in werewolves: families had likely told tales about them for generations."[19] Although the previous assertion is unverifiable, the Church's reactions and Marie de France's introduction to *Bisclavret* indicate that the werewolf tradition was widespread. Part of the ecclesiastic concern was connected to lay discussions of Eucharistic transubstantiation, with the werewolf, for example, serving as a metaphor for the metamorphic host.[20] Massey argues that Gerald's "understanding of werewolves is dangerously similar to the contemporary medieval understanding of both the hypostatic union of Christ (at once human and divine) and the transubstantiation of the Eucharist (flesh in substance, bread in accident)."[21] The werewolf (simultaneously human and animal) then becomes a metaphor for Christ (simultaneously divine and human). These similarities offered the lay public an avenue by which to discuss questions of Eucharistic transubstantiation, which was otherwise forbidden by Church law. This movement culminated in the issuance of Regino's *Canon episcopi*, ca. 900, that officially called the belief in metamorphosis blasphemy and was repeated throughout the period.

Secular writers such as Marie de France and the anonymous author of *Guillaume de Palerne* revived the Ovidian tradition during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries for different reasons. As Bynum, among others, argues, books one to fifteen of *Metamorphoses* appear to be the most influential parts of Ovid's work in the twelfth century. The idea of mutability as a representation of fertility and vitality has obvious appeal to an author seeking artistic inspiration. Mutability has its own allure as a literary device, especially in the Ovidian tradition, as a symbol of sexuality related as it

commonly is to Jupiter's infidelity or other gods chasing mortals. However, several secular authors heavily modified their use of the werewolf between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries. Bynum sums up what has been demonstrated by several scholars: "[f]erocious, hairy, dripping with blood, a devourer of human beings, the werewolf of Pliny, Ovid, and Petronius is, like the werewolf of modern TV and folk story, an emblem of the periodic eruption of the bestial from within the human."[22] The common medieval secular rendition, however, was modified to become what is currently called the sympathetic werewolf, one that the audience is concerned for rather than afraid of.

## Medieval Wolves

In order to understand more fully the changes that medieval writers made to the werewolf, taking a moment to look at medieval representations of natural wolves seems appropriate. Understanding what the authors and their contemporary readers thought about the real, mundane cousins of their literary creations should offer some insight into what the audience was likely to expect when they approached a werewolf story and a further insight into how and why the authors modified the Ovidian tradition.

Throughout the history of English folklore and interest in the natural world, the wolf has been associated with a variety of socially unacceptable traits. Both Montague

Summers and Jean Jorgensen have pointed to this tendency. Summers states that the "distinctive features of the wolf are unbridled cruelty, bestial ferocity, and ravening hunger. [. . .] He is the symbol of Night and Winter, of Stress and Storm, the dark and mysterious harbinger of Death."[23] Considerably more sympathetic, Jorgensen states that the "wolf has been unfavorably depicted by both writers and artists as ferocious and evil, an animal not to be trusted."[24] This animalistic violence is clearly, according to medieval authors, something to be feared because it was irrational and could strike out at anyone. Human violence, in contrast, was believed to be logical violence deriving from clearly discernible, and socially logical, causes such as vengeance or drunkenness. Since the same writers established that the distinguishing trait for humans as opposed to animals was the capacity for rational, logical thought—despite evidence that animal violence could be caused by excessive hunger, being cornered, or mistreatment—this distinction held sway for most of the medieval period.

Commonly connected to outlaws, and in fact even being hanged from the gallows with executed criminals in some areas of northern Europe, the wolf became seen as an anti-social outsider.[25] This characterization comes into common use in spite of the demonstrable fact that wolves are naturally social within their own species and that other canines, when domesticated, are highly social beings. The idea that wolves were anti-social explains a great deal of the folklore and stories surrounding both literary wolves and their cousin, the werewolf. Looking far back into the traditions that held the greatest influence on medieval English culture, Summers claims that biblically the wolf appears as a sign of "treachery, savagery, and bloodthirstiness"[26] as well as being associated with

heretics.[27] For example, Jeremiah 5.6 states: "Therefore a lion from the forest / shall slay them, / a wolf from the desert shall / destroy them / . . . / because their transgressions are many, / their apostasies are great."[28] Ezekiel 22.27 adds: "Her princes in the midst of her are like wolves tearing the prey, shedding blood, destroying lives to get dishonest gain." This heretical connection displays another appearance of anti-social wolves, those who remove themselves not only from the Christian community but also from the collective formed by God's creatures.

Ancient Roman belief made strong connections between the she-wolf and a combination of cruelty and lust, thus the aforementioned use of the term *lupa* to mean both she-wolf and prostitute. As several scholars, including Summers, have noted, "In classical authors the wolf is the eternal symbol of ferocity and inordinate evil appetite, hard by which rides cruel devouring lust."[29] Because of these views, the common feature of classical and medieval werewolf literature is that, according to Jorgensen, the defining werewolf trait is a "frenzied desire of the beast for human flesh."[30] This characteristic is commonly deployed by religious and folkloric authors as a means to justify associations of the werewolf with demons or to use the wolf as an example of society gone wrong. On the other hand, it is something that literary and socio-political authors have to overcome if they want to employ the sympathetic werewolf, as in the cases of Marie de France (ca. 1160-1215) and Gerald of Wales (1146-1223).

Marie approaches common views of wolves in her collection of fables. In these cases, unlike her *lais*, she embraces and promotes the negative qualities of the wolf. Throughout the fables, predatory animals such as the lion are commonly used to represent

the nobility while grazing or game animals take the place of the lower classes. Because of this division, audiences expect the wolf to be a member of the nobility, which it commonly is (and in the medieval wolf/werewolf tales the wolves are all noble males, with Gerald's being the only extant exception). However, Marie's fable wolves are shown as gluttonous, greedy, thieving, and murderous, perfectly in keeping with previous traditions. In these cases, as Joyce Salisbury states, "social ills were caused by predators [. . .] who did not adhere to the rules of correct behavior for the ruling class."[31] By stepping outside his position in society, becoming dissatisfied with life as an ideal fief-holding noble true to his oaths of fidelity, the wolf character fulfills a traditionally anti-social role and violates the structure that keeps society functioning.[32] Therefore, as Salisbury notes, the "courtly fables turned the wolf into the villain not because he was a predator, but because he was excessively greedy. In fables, wolves become a metaphor for nobility gone astray."[33] The morals of the fables clearly focus on following moderation, maintaining the status quo, staying in one's socio-geographic place, and remaining loyal to the fief-granting lord.

Due to the combined effect of social views regarding wolf species and their predation upon livestock, the Saxon and Anglo-Norman kings did what they could to exterminate the wolf population in England, Wales, and Cornwall. Eventually these practices—usually the substitution of wolf pelts for coinage as payment of tributes or the offer of rewards for pelts—caused the wolf population on the island to become extinct. Exact dates for this extermination vary widely and range from before the Norman invasion to the late medieval period. Whatever the era, with the native wolf population

removed, local tales of werewolves slowly vanished. Although the wolves were gone, belief in werewolves maintained a foothold in England in tales ranging from Marie's *Bisclavret* to *William of Palerne* (a translated French tale), and in imported stories about Stubbe Peeter, which remained popular (based on the speed with which they were translated and adapted) for centuries after the last wolf was killed. Local stories of man-wolves were replaced with tales of people turning into cats, weasels, hares, and other animals.[34] Usually these animal transformations were associated with witchcraft; most appear to come from the late medieval to late early modern periods.

The other major sources of information regarding medieval views on normal wolves are the bestiaries produced during the period. Two of the most representative bestiaries are Albert the Great's (Albertus Magnus') *Man and the Beasts* in the thirteenth-century and the anonymously authored twelfth-century *The Bestiary*. Both texts provide fodder for, or are based on, the tales circulated through fables and folklore. Of the two, Albert's is the more objective in his discussion of the characteristics of the wolf. He states that the wolf is "an animal well known for its fierce and crafty disposition"[35] and rapacious nature. However, he also notes that wolves are communal in their packs, as well as bold and cunning. In spite of their cunning, Albert says wolves can be tamed, though he cautions that they always hate hunters and sheep. He attempts to make logical sense of the actions of wolves by explaining that they have a natural hatred for sheep, which is why they hunt sheep in the first place. Interestingly, Albert does say that "[r]arely wolves eat human beings; but after tasting the sweetness of human flesh, they may attack men without provocation."[36] The implications are that, if they have not eaten

a human before, they will only attack when provoked and that, in his experience, reports of wolves eating humans are not particularly common. The other interesting claim that Albert advances is that a wolf's brain grows and shrinks as the moon waxes and wanes. This idea may influence the later connection made between a werewolf's transformation and the full moon.[37] Albert characteristically finds a purpose or use for nearly every animal in his bestiary. For the wolf, he claims that wearing a wolf-skin belt or skirt can cure colic. Such belts and skirts were also commonly the means by which a man could be transformed into a werewolf, so there is a clear association between werewolves and illness, as I will show later with translations of the character Bisclavret's name.

The anonymous author of *The Bestiary* presents a more theological perspective on the wolf as well as more detailed reasons for the traits the wolf is supposed to possess. The author explains, "they are called *Licus* in Greek on account of their bites, because they massacre anybody who passes by with a fury of greediness."[38] According to this bestiary, the wolf's strength resides in the jaws and chest, the body areas used in eating. Moreover, wolves are said to subsist on prey when they can catch something, but on earth and air when there is no game. In addition, the association of wolves with prostitution is explained by this author thus: "Wolves are known for their rapacity, and for this reason we call prostitutes wolves, because they devastate the possessions of their lovers."[39] Connected to this explanation is the folk tradition that a wolf has an aphrodisiacal patch of hair on its back, which is only effective if it is removed while the wolf is still alive.[40] This author is quite thorough in his discussion of the wolf, carefully relating the story that

if a wolf sees a man first, the man will be struck dumb, while if the man sees it first, the wolf becomes docile and incapable of running.

This background information is presented by *The Bestiary's* author in order to make a theological point. The important parts of the entry are the ways in which the wolf's nature can be seen in Satan. According to this author, the devil roams the edges of the proverbial flock just as the wolf prowls the edge of the real flock. The other connections that the author makes are interesting enough to quote in detail:

> That a wolf should be born during the first thunder of the month of May symbolizes that the Devil fell from heaven in the first motion of his pride.
>
> Moreover, since this creature keeps its strength in its fore parts and not in its backward parts, it signifies that this same Satan was at first forward among the angels of light and was only made an apostate by the hindward way.
>
> [. . .]
>
> Because a wolf is never able to turn its neck backward, except with a movement of the whole body, it means that the Devil never turns back to lay hold on repentance.[41]

The finagling involved in fitting the wolf into a theological lesson is notable because it mirrors various theological attempts to grapple with the issues surrounding the werewolf, such as those by Augustine, Regino, and Henri Boguet.[42] This entry ends its theological focus with the explanation that since wolves equal Satan, the voice that a man loses when the wolf sees him is the voice he needs to "cry out to the saints"[43] for spiritual help, and "man," obviously, stands for the mortal sinner. While not directly stated, presumably

only the orthodox and faithful man can steal the wolf's courage and ferocity by spotting it first. Strangely, the entry ends with a description of a flying wolf in Ethiopia (or Africa as a whole), which the audience is assured never attacks man.

## Theological Monstrosity

Even though many Christian authors used various animals as examples, according to Salisbury, they emphasized the doctrine of species difference in order to define themselves against the pagan Graeco-Roman "belief in the close proximity of humans and animals,"[44] as represented by the Ovidian tradition. In order to preserve the distinction between species, ecclesiastical writers generally repudiated belief in metamorphosis, especially that involved with the werewolf. As Massey concludes, "if we look to the condemnations listed in penitentials and correctors from Regino to Sprenger, the Church sought to erase all theriomorphs (human-animal shape-changers): werewolves, snake-women, and stag-men."[45] Dennis Kratz further notes that Saint Boniface tied belief in werewolves to the work of the Devil because it was the "doctrine of the Church that werewolves do not exist."[46] Sometime during the twelfth century, certain Church writers, notably those on the fringes of Christendom in such places as the British Isles and Scandinavia, began to question these transformations. The majority of

the questions they developed regarded the humanity of the subject. That is, they, like Gerald of Wales, wondered whether the werewolf retained a human soul even as it appeared to be a wolf. This particular question was important because of the role of the human soul in Christian theology. The key point was, as Kratz notes, that "[s]in is impossible in a being lacking reason, for sin involves the rational consent of the human to temptation."[47] So the werewolf without a soul does not sin, but by the same token, it cannot be saved: "the purely animal nature is also without the possibility of salvation; for it is reason that permits men to overcome temptation and receive God's grace."[48] Because humanity was generally defined as having the capacity for reason while animals were irrational, and because the capacity for reason is both the cause of and salvation from sin, the questions of humanity that the werewolf embodies have far-reaching theological consequences. Therefore, many ecclesiastical writers decided that denying the existence of shape-changing beings was better than wrestling with questions of reason and salvation in that context, especially when the much clearer case of the Plinian races[49] was available. Of equal importance was the aforementioned use of werewolves and other shape-changing beings as metaphors for Eucharistic transubstantiation.[50] So, in Kratz's words, "the Christian rejection of the reality of the werewolf is essentially a rejection of two frightening notions: that God or the devil can divorce a living person from the possibility of Heaven; and conversely, that a man can commit a sinful act for which he is not responsible."[51] The first notion hints at the Manichean heresy, implying as it does that the Devil is equal in power to God. The second acts as a precursor to later views of

predestination and had the potential to remove the possibility of both free will and deserved atonement.

To further understand the theological issues involved with werewolf belief, I turn back to Albert the Great and his bestiary. Book twenty-two of *Man and the Beasts* begins by defining humans. Notably, Albert pairs humans with the quadrupeds, as distinct from the flying animals, aquatic animals, tiny anemic animals, and the reptiles. Even with this pairing, he clearly divides man from the other land animals by including two different tracts in book twenty-two, unlike the other books. With this division, one can detect a Derridian definition of humanity by a naming of what it is not: man is human because he is not a beast/quadruped. However, Albert also includes positive definitional qualities. Connected to the requirement that a being have a human soul in order to sin or receive salvation, Albert states that "[o]ne of the properties peculiar to human nature is the feeling of shame engendered by committing an evil deed."[52] Because of this unique faculty, one that comes from being created in the image of God, he further states that man is the only member of the animal kingdom able to determine the difference between good and evil. All other animals, says Albert, "seek only the useful and the pleasurable."[53] Among the traits that Albert cites that differentiate man from the other animals are the capacities for speech, for an ordered/harmonious life, for virtue, and for "delight in speculating about theoretical matters."[54] Although other theologians, such as Augustine, directly addressed the issue of human-to-animal transformation in order to dismiss it, Albert comes to the question indirectly. His statement regarding a human who behaves in a bestial fashion—that "if a man freely chooses to abase himself to the level of the

world, he sheds the dignity of his humanity and assumes the nature of a beast"[55]—can equally be applied to the idea of a man choosing to change his physical form into that of an animal. This concept becomes a major issue for Albert because "man is the point of union between God and the world."[56]

Augustine defines "humanity" much more simply: "whoever is anywhere born a man, that is, a rational mortal animal, no matter what unusual appearance he presents in color, movement, sound, nor how peculiar he is in some power, part, or quality of his nature, no Christian can doubt that he springs from [Noah]."[57] Rational and immortal animals are clearly angels; therefore an Augustinian perspective places man between the angels and the beasts. According to Bynum, the twelfth-century interest in shape-shifting is best explained by noting that there is a "fascination with, and horror at, the possibility that persons might, actually or symbolically, become beasts or angels."[58] In many ways, as seen by Terry Pratchett, this fascination still exists.

Questions regarding the animal-human-angel division, because there has always been an assumption that there was a distinction, were important for most of the bestiary writers and theologians who approached beliefs in the werewolf or the Plinian races. This division was related to discussions of God's power and therefore, according to John Carey, a worldly reason for concern on the part of ecclesiastics arose because, "[a] belief that the souls of certain individuals can leave their bodies in the shapes of beasts or birds, and that the body must not be moved during the soul's absence is widely attested in European folklore."[59] Should this belief get out of hand, that is, should the Church not rein it in and exert some control, the distinction between the Christian and the pagan is

threatened, as do a number of doctrinal statements about the position and power of God. Therefore, the Church followed Augustine in denying the physical reality of human-to-animal metamorphosis by adopting his distinction between illusory and real change, thereby officially excising some of the Eucharistic discussion.[60] The core doctrinal element supporting the decision was the oft-stated position that only God could transform beings, whether internally or externally. Any other transformations were said to be the work of demons and were, therefore, mere illusion.

To defend this position, Augustine relates the stories of Diomedes' companions being metamorphosed into birds (*City of God* 18.16) and Ulysses' men being turned into animals by Circe (18.17). Then he briefly describes "the Arcadians, who, by lot, swam across a certain pool, and were turned into wolves there, [. . .] [I]f they never fed on human flesh for nine years, they were restored to the human form"[61] by swimming back across the pool; he also refers to Demarchus (whom he calls Demaenetus). After relating these stories, Augustine notes that they may or may not have happened. However, if they did happen, he says, they were not real human-to-animal transformations because the "mind did not become bestial, but remained rational and human."[62] Such illusory transformations, Augustine tells his readers, were caused by demons (the Roman gods), a view commonly held by early Church fathers. Because demons were the cause, he argues, such metamorphoses must be mere illusions, that is, a glamor had been cast over the person to make him seem to be an animal. That said, he does admit that this theory leaves room for the soul to leave the body and possess an animal (or create a spiritual animal) while the body sleeps—a phenomenon which today is referred to as a psychic

werewolf (or psychic projection werewolf in the latter case). Moreover, these illusions only work, says Augustine, because God allows the demons to have such powers, which He can presumably take away whenever He wishes. As Massey notes, this is characteristic, of Augustine's "thoughtful finagling, especially when the magic in question involved the transformation of human beings, who, as creatures made in God's image, could not be changed essentially by any but God Himself."[63]

In response to Augustine, Bynum notes that, theologically speaking, for Augustine and his contemporaries "the crucial preservation of identity is non-change."[64] Part of the theological problem with change of identity is the question of whether identity follows the physical form or the spiritual. If identity follows the physical form and, as Barkan states, "[i]f human beings, animals, and gods can all exchange shapes, then the definition of man's shape, and indeed the whole hierarchy ranging from the natural world to God, is thrown into confusion."[65] This is especially true when we take into account the Book of Genesis, in which man is said to be created in God's image. Therefore, if man can turn into an animal, leaving the physical shape of divine perfection, one or more of three premises must be true: (1) that particular man is not really a man (he is a demon); (2) he is being aided by a demon through illusion; and/or (3) he has debased himself through sin.

However, as David Williams states in the passage quoted at the beginning of this chapter, the idea of changing one's form is terrifying, yet at the same time highly liberating. As with any change, the ability to break—or the idea of breaking—the hierarchical boundaries of society evokes fear of the unknown, a fear that is inextricably

tied to an innately human sense of wonder and curiosity regarding novelty. This love of novelty is aptly expressed in the medieval mind through the popularity of bestiaries filled with odd creatures and a fascination with the Plinian races. If the boundary between man and animal is erased, as in the case of the werewolf, then man may appear to be ultimately irrational and immoral. The Church fathers fought incessantly against this idea—as seen in Augustine's attempts to demystify Ovid—by finding rational, allegorical, or metaphorical explanations for presentations of metamorphosis. Other theological concerns enter the discussion when the connection between humanity's dual nature (man-beast) is paralleled by Christ's (man-god).[66] Both then become connected to cannibalism, because of the symbolic cannibalism implicit in the Eucharist. This association of the cannibalistic werewolf with the symbolically cannibalistic Eucharist offered secular writers an opportunity to discuss the idea of transubstantiation through metaphor.

The Eucharist, and its relationship to humans versus beasts, is also a central issue in Gerald of Wales' account of werewolves. This story is told third-hand, for Gerald says he was consulted by a group of Irish bishops and abbots who were adjudicating the case of another priest. This priest was traveling from Ulster to Meath around 1182 or 1183, according to Gerald. On the border of Meath, he camped with a young boy, presumably his assistant. That night a wolf approached the camp and spoke to him. Concerned and amazed, the priest asked the wolf several questions, to which the wolf responded by speaking of God and providing orthodox answers. Somewhat satisfied, the priest listened to the wolf's story: "We are natives of Ossory. From there every seven years, because of

the imprecation of a certain saint, namely the abbot Natalis, two persons, a man and a woman, are compelled to go into exile"[67] as wolves. His companion, a she-wolf, was dying, and he sought a priest to perform last rites for her, but offered no explanation as to why she was dying. The nameless priest followed along and began to perform the sacrament. He finished without offering the she-wolf last communion, until the male asked him to do so. Even then, the priest balked, until the wolf "pulled all the skin off the she-wolf from the head down to the navel"[68] to display an old woman. Only then did the priest seem fully convinced of the story. The reason this particular account came to trial, Gerald says, is because the priest later questioned whether he should have given communion to the she-wolf. Ostensibly the question comes from the human-animal divide. As previously noted, the irrational animal was believed to be incapable of salvation. Therefore, if the priest administered communion (or any sacrament) to a beast, he could be censured for blaspheming the sacrament. If the werewolf were indeed human, however, the priest was simply doing his duty to a fellow Christian. In this case, Gerald is not concerned so much with the theological possibility or impossibility of the werewolf, but rather with its humanity and doctrinal status. The latter is important not only in Church law but in secular law as well, because if the werewolf is truly an animal when (s)he appears to be a wolf, then a different set of rules apply, compared to what would apply if the wolf is a human in an animal guise.[69]

Beyond Gerald's legalistic concern, we find several other problematic points of note. The first, and perhaps most obvious, is Gerald's concern with the moral and religious well-being of the Irish. In the other stories and accounts he relates, Gerald

commonly makes moral judgments, subtle or otherwise. This particular story has some serious moral implications, from the source of the curse to the beliefs it engenders. Even though Gerald never states what the citizens of Ossory did to draw Abbot Natalis' ire, clearly it was something related to conversion (or re-conversion), since the saint is specifically mentioned; therefore divine will fuels the curse's effectiveness. In this way, as Massey notes, "Gerald claims that werewolves can physically metamorphose within the Christian world because they are the product of the Christian God."[70]

Interestingly, two other medieval werewolf accounts mirror Gerald's. One comes from John of Nüremburg, and is very similar to Gerald's. The other comes from a Norse retelling of Gerald's story, *Speculum Regale* (thirteenth century). In this version, the saint in question is the more widely known Saint Patrick and the reason for the curse is given. According to the Norse version, the people of Ossory insulted and jeered Saint Patrick as he attempted to convert them.[71] The latter story ties in with certain traditional lycanthropy tales, as conversion to Christianity was a commonly cited cure for shape-shifting, especially for werewolves.

The story of the werewolves of Ossory-Meath is one of many tales in which God or the saints use transformation as a means of punishment. For some Church writers, notably Augustine, this human-to-animal transformation is a metaphor for the real conversion of the individual to Christianity. Likewise, according to Carey, the story "may be a piece of conscious symbolism on Gerald's part, reflecting his view that beneath their savage exterior the Irish were fundamentally good."[72] Since one of the missions of the English invasion was to bring the Irish back to the orthodox Catholic

faith, a strong case can be made for positioning Gerald's story in missionary terms. The Irish are thus characterized as "bad" Christians who need to be brought back to Rome. They become a scapegoat for the English, who can then point to Ireland as a region further on the fringes, from Rome, than they are. The werewolf is a perfect metaphor for this sort of identification since it lives on the fringes of society, both human and non-human, accepted by neither men nor beasts. Through Augustine, then, Gerald contends that werewolves, and the Irish, have a core humanity, which allows them to achieve salvation and to be converted to orthodox Christianity.

In political terms, the characterization of the Irish as human-shaped beasts is read by Rhonda Knight as creating a justification for the invasion after the fact. In order to justify the English invasion of Ireland, then, Gerald writes to blur the boundary between man and beast among the subjugated natives, who therefore need English rule so that they can rejoin humanity. In Knight's postcolonial interpretation, "the werewolves of Meath connect the indigenous Irish population to hybrid creatures,"[73] thus making Ireland the borderland of monsters and marvels, with the invasion's intent being the reformation of the native population. Simultaneously, she notes that most of the soldiers who made up the invasion force were Marchers–half-English and half-Welsh–who joined the expedition for the promise of land and other rewards. On one hand, the werewolf story continues the ideology that the colonial invasion was a mission to save the sinning Irish. On the other hand, the werewolves are representations of the socio-political border place that the Marchers themselves were in: the half-human, half-beast standing in for the half-English, half-Welsh or, in Gerald's case, the three-fourths Norman, one-fourth Welsh.

Another theological point of discussion (as well as doctrinal problem) was attached to the view of the Irish—and thus the Ossory-Meath werewolves—as sinners. Gerald repeatedly implies that the particular sin that ran rampant throughout Ireland was bestiality, as evidenced by his numerous stories of hybrid human-like beasts. According to Gerald and others, bestiality was a cause of hybrid creatures, potentially including werewolves. This theory is especially problematic because it undermines the separation of man and the beasts by insisting that human-animal sexual relations were fertile and commonly produced offspring. If that was the case, could men and animals really be as divided as the Church fathers said? The fact that this question arose is an indication that there was a breakdown of the Christian separation of man and beasts in, or around, the twelfth century especially in regard to attitudes toward a "racial" other. Further signs that serve to blur the lines between species include an increasing interest in the physical world as an object of study (thus bestiaries and Gerald's topography), the popularization of animal stories (including beast fables), and the increasing use of animal exemplars (including werewolves as devout Christians).

Salisbury notes that during the missionary phase in Europe, "Christians added legislation to restrict sexual contact between the species,"[74] which usually involved some sort of mild penance, in order to increase the divide between species. Salisbury theorizes, based on local court and church records throughout Europe, that the Church felt the need to institute such legislation because bestiality was relatively common, and accepted, in the pre-conversion era. She points to records of secular legal codes that lack laws regarding bestiality before the codes were revised in Christian terms. Within a year or

two of conversion, the populations of these same areas have records of anti-bestiality laws, implying that no such relations were occurring before Christian missionaries arrived, that such relations were frowned upon but not legislated against, or that such relations were socially acceptable. While all three options are likely, the exact cause in a given area is irrelevant. The important point is that, by asserting that the favorite sin of the Irish is bestiality and that bestiality is indeed a sin, Gerald reiterates the divide between men and beasts in order to distance Christianity from the various pagans, whether savage or civilized in the Christian mind. Ironically, in the act of adopting the trope, Gerald undermines it by insisting that such relations can produce hybrids (including, by implication, werewolves).

The presence of prohibitions against bestiality is linked not only to hybridity but also to racial "othering" present in Gerald's account. By creating a connection between bestiality and the Irish, Gerald posits a prohibition regarding mixed races—such as English-Welsh, Norman-Welsh, or Irish-English mixes. This occurs because the Irish are then characterized as bestial themselves, as represented by the Ossory-Meath werewolves, and therefore fall within the bestiality prohibition. Thus the text serves to forbid relationships between the Irish and the conquering Marchers. However, the admonition is undermined both by the idea that bestiality can produce offspring (thus removing the divide between species) and the fact that it is found in an author who is himself a hybrid "monster" (mixing the conquered Welsh and conquering Norman).

## Sympathetic Noble Wolves

In contrast to the cautionary and theological concerns articulated in the most frequently cited ecclesiastical sources, secular literary sources take a much more benign position regarding werewolves. A number of werewolf tales began appearing in France and England during the twelfth century, which some scholars have tied to the rise of interest in alchemy and transubstantiation.[75] Another possibility for the apparent rise of interest in such stories is the fact that werewolves simultaneously attract and repulse audiences, something that is as true in the twenty-first century as it was in the twelfth century, as evidenced by the number of modern monster movies involving werewolves. Although the attraction is a general reason for stories about werewolves across time, it becomes significant here because the attraction-repulsion involved in the werewolf is, as will be shown, not the same as it is with other monsters. Additionally, there is the novelty of seeing, reading, or hearing about a being that possesses a paradoxical body, mixing both man and beast (also shown by the continuing popularity of such figures as Bigfoot and Batboy). This paradoxical body is commonly discussed as a point of attraction because, as Edith Benkov states, "Part-man, part-beast, the dual nature of the werewolf epitomizes the dilemma of humankind."[76]

The three major texts that present sympathetic werewolf figures—the Old French *Bisclavret* by Marie de France (c. 1190), the Middle English *William of Palerne* (a fourteenth-century translation of a twelfth-century French romance), and the Middle

English *Arthur and Gorlagon* (fourteenth-century)—each exhibit a tendency to define humanity not by appearance, but by actions. Likewise, all three include the idea that metamorphosis, according to Barkan, "involves a special relation between man and his environment; and one of the important lessons to be learned from this relationship is that we can never act entirely alone."[77] Bisclavret, Alphouns, and Gorlagon all display this sense of community-building in that none of them is able to speak or effect his return to human shape alone. All three need the assistance of others—the unnamed wise man; William and the King of Spain; and the werewolf's brother king, respectively—either to interpret their actions or to force those who trapped them in wolf form to restore their former shape.

The earliest of these texts is also the most frequently discussed. In Marie de France's *Bisclavret*, the paradoxes inherent in werewolf literature are stated from the very beginning. After a brief comparison of the terms used for the creature by the Bretons and the Normans, Marie supports the veracity of her tale by stating that "In the old days, people used to say— / and it often actually happened— / that some men turned into werewolves / and lived in the woods" (5-8).[78] Immediately after this assertion, the audience is told that "A werewolf is a savage beast; / while his fury is on him / he eats men, does much harm, / goes deep into the forest to live" (9-12). However, the knight on whom she focuses her narrative is known for being handsome, loved, and noble. She states that he is close to his lord and neighbors as well, quite the opposite of what the audience expects, and a departure from his classical precursors. The only blot on his otherwise perfect state is that "during the week he would be missing / for three whole

days" (25-6). Contrary to some modern critics, such as Benkov who has stated that "Marie makes Bisclavret an unfortunate who has no control over his nature. His unwilling transformation is cyclical and is framed by undressing,"[79] there are no signs, at least in Robert Hanning and Joan Ferrante's translation, that the transformation is involuntary on the knight's part, nor that it is particularly cyclical (the *lai* does not say or indicate that the change necessarily occurs on the same three days every week). Admittedly, as a presumably constitutional werewolf, Bisclavret has no control over his nature and he certainly follows some sort of cycle, but as a well-loved knight in his lord's good graces, he is hardly "unfortunate" and does potentially control his cycle.

In fact, the knight appears to be quite happy and pleased with his ability. His only moments of doubt occur when, in answer to his wife's questions his absence, he states "Harm will come to me if I tell you about this, / because I'd lose your love / and even my very self" (54-6). His reluctance to explain what he does during those three days does not stem from any particular shame attached to being a werewolf, as Adam Douglas suggests[80]; rather, the knight is prophetically concerned with losing his wife's love, a sign that he knows her better than he is generally believed to, since she does in fact turn against him (understandably so, given Marie's introduction to the *lai*) and insure that he will be trapped in his wolf shape. Had he been especially shamed by his condition, would the knight have given in at all? Once his wife finally gets him speaking, though, the knight Bisclavret unfolds the entire story rather quickly. Matilda Bruckner argues that what is notable here is the fact that he never states why the transformation occurs.[81] The audience never knows whether the change is caused by a curse or some act on the

knight's part, or whether it is just a natural talent. Although many modern critics have assumed that the transformation is involuntary and the result of a curse, Kirby Smith best approaches the question by stating that "We must suppose [. . .] that [Marie] looks upon the Bisclavret's transformations as an unfortunate necessity which nature has imposed on his organization."[82] That is, in Smith's view, the character is what he calls a "constitutional werewolf," one that changes shape because of a talent he was born with. Certainly, Bisclavret requires his clothing to effect the transformation. However, barring any unforeseen circumstances, he has the ability to choose when he dons and removes his clothing, thereby strengthening the case for a voluntary aspect of his change. That is, we have no evidence that anyone forces the knight to remove his clothing, or to put it back on. He appears to perform both acts of his own volition. Lacking any other evidence in the text, and noting that Bisclavret is not cured at the end of the *lai* but is still a werewolf, we must come back to Frank Hamel's assertion that "[i]n spite of the unpleasant consequences with which lycanthropy seems to be connected there is little doubt that transformation used to be regarded as a useful and sometimes profitable relaxation"[83] and that this may be the case with Marie's knight. If we accept this interpretation, then Bisclavret's recreational hunting mirrors the king's, thus creating another bond between the two men, one that is not shared by the knight's wife.

The nameless wife's horror is understandable on two levels, both related to reproduction. If we assume that Bisclavret's condition is genetic and a natural ability, which given the lack of evidence to the contrary appears reasonable, then presumably it can be passed on to any children the knight and his wife might have. Thus, the wife

could be complicit in producing another *garvulf* that constitutes a threat to the realm because of its cannibalistic diet. According to the secular legal system, she could potentially be tried for treason or as a witch. On perhaps a more important level, by sleeping with the wolf-in-knight's-clothing, one could argue that she technically commits the sin of bestiality. In addition, she does so with a monstrous hybrid whom common tales accuse of cannibalism and "much harm" (11). Given Marie's introduction, she justifiably fears for her life, like Niceros, but unlike Petronius' tale the sexualized/erotic aspect is also present and important in legal, theological, and moral terms. By this argument, not only would she fear for her life, but also for her afterlife. She clearly sees adultery as the lesser of two evils, perhaps one that is even cancelled out by her rejection of the monstrous beast.

After Bisclavret runs around in the woods for some time, a common medieval werewolf story trope appears, and it is matched in each of the Middle English works. Bisclavret comes across a king and appeals for mercy, just as Gorlagon and Alphouns do in later tales—or a prince in Alphouns' case. The ruler recognizes that the wolf has the capacity for reason and so takes the wolf into his care. In all three cases, the wolf is helpful and noble, well behaved, and loved by all those who come in contact with him (although it takes some time for Gorlagon to settle down, and Alphouns scares several people in order to acquire food and shelter for William). And in each case, the wolf attacks the female figure who trapped him in the animal shape. This incident is always explained away and serves to uncover the plot in all three tales. As noted previously, each wolf is then assisted in returning to his human shape.

In Marie's *lai* we see all of the criteria used by medieval artists and writers to define humanity: clothing, diet, reason, use of tools, and speech. After his transformation, Bisclavret loses his clothing, and presumably changes his diet at least until he enters the court. He also retains his capacity for reason, loses his ability to use tools, and, most importantly, loses the ability to speak. I say that he presumably changes his diet because, as Bruckner also notes, "no mention of what Bisclavret actually does in the forest [. . .] no lurid details about blood and violence, no flesh devouring"[84] exist in the *lai*, unlike Gorlagon's case and those of prior stories. The lack of speech is made up for by the transformed wolf's ability to use reason. He manages to employ his reason, as the king observes, "It has the mind of a man, and it's begging for mercy!" (154), and "This beast is rational—he has a mind" (157) after Bisclavret prostrates himself, as a wolf, before the king. This act shows that according to most medieval definitions, including Augustine's, he is a man rather than a beast, despite his lack of human form.

Marie employs this divide between man and beast, as well as Bisclavret's retention of his core human identity, to introduce and discuss a variety of questions. Since the socio-political questions she introduces will be discussed later, here I will focus on the questions surrounding identity and humanity. One of the most important signs of identity is an individual's name. Independently, H. W. Bailey has translated "bisclavret" as: 1) rational wolf, 2) speaking wolf, or 3) clothed wolf,[85] and William Sayers has translated the term as leprous wolf.[86] All three of the initial translations have their application, although some are more problematic than others. "Rational wolf" is clear in that Bisclavret displays rationality. "Speaking wolf" can be argued, since even though he

lacks a voice of his own, Bisclavret manages to communicate with the court through a form of sign language and through the voice of the nameless wise man. "Clothed wolf" is more problematic in that it is precisely the loss of clothing that causes him to change shape. However, while in his human shape, Bisclavret is certainly a wolf in human's clothing. The "leprous wolf" translation is the most interesting. According to Sayers, "[t]raditions associated leprosy with carnality, unbridled sexual appetite, and, on the symbolic level, with moral depravity and even heresy."[87] It is no coincidence that these are the same traits associated with lycanthropy by many of the Church sources from the same period, as we saw earlier. Moreover, there is the connection to Bisclavret's unnamed wife, who loses her nose, a traditional sign of leprosy that is often noted by modern critics. Even as his name allows several plausible definitions of his character, Bisclavret's identity is simultaneously stolen in that Marie uses the term "bisclavret" as both a common and a proper noun, thereby reducing the character to a type and negating his identity.

This loss of identity is part of his transformation into a wolf. Kathryn Holton notes that, "[h]e becomes mute, loses his name and identity, loses his clothing,"[88] all the things associated with humanity. Even today, the combination of name, speech (patterns and tone), and clothing is considered to be inextricably linked to identity. In Bisclavret's case, though, he never really has a name of his own, being referred to either as a knight or a bisclavret, that is, his social status or the wolf he becomes. Although Holton argues that Bisclavret completely loses his humanity, and thus his identity, Bruckner counters that "transformed into the shape of a wolf, Bisclavret is no less human than he was at the

beginning of his story."[89] As previously noted, the character retains his rational mind and core self, therefore keeping at least a fragment of his identity, even if the outward trappings are gone. According to Augustinian theories regarding humanity, this retention of the soul alone means that he has managed to retain his humanity. As with definitions of humanity, though, Bisclavret has the Derridian problem of self-definition. Taking that route, Bruckner concludes that "Bisclavret conceals his dual nature because he himself does not fully understand it, cannot so long as it remains a secret known only to himself, since his identity can only be defined in relation to another,"[90] that is, to what he is not. This lack of self-definition also applies to his social status in that Bisclavret is defined based on his relationships with the king, his fellow knights, and his wife. The werewolf, in this case, calls into question the outward signs and trappings of identity and humanity. The audience can see this problem and determine Marie's answer to the question because, according to Williams, "those who rely on the material sign mistake the werewolf for a ferocious beast; only the wise who look beyond appearances [. . .] are able to see the true nature concealed beneath the wrong form."[91] In this case, the use of appearance is a lesson both for the individual and for the court. The individual gets the mixed message that outward trappings are both unimportant and necessary to define one's identity because Bisclavret retains his core personality even when he is a wolf, but loses his social status. Bynum notes that individual identity, in the twelfth century, refers to an emphasis on "inner motivation, on the emotions, on psychological development."[92] In other words, rather than fitting a modern definition of individuality, Bisclavret's individuality involves knowing his core human nature, created in God's image. Connected to the trappings of

society, this identification also involves "a quite self-conscious interest in the process of belonging to groups and filling roles,"[93] which Bisclavret, especially, cannot have without his clothing and human form.

Medieval literary sources typically employ one of two very generalized types of werewolf, either one that changes periodically (whether voluntarily or not) or one that is changed for a set or indefinite period of time by some external agency. Bisclavret is clearly from the former group because even though he needs his clothing to change back into a human, he can choose when he puts the clothing on. But his contemporary, Alphouns, comes from the latter. Alphouns is not technically a werewolf, according to a strict definition because he is incapable of changing back to human form of his own volition. However, under the broad definition previously discussed, he fits well within the scope of this exploration.

The *Romance of William of Palerne*, in which Alphouns the werewolf is an important and necessary, if marginal, figure is quite long, slightly convoluted in plot, and difficult to summarize. The first 180-200 lines are missing, so we have to extrapolate that part of the back-story from the original French source, *Guillaume de Palerne*. Based on that source, William, the four-year-old son of the king and queen of Palerne, is stolen by a wolf before his uncle can have him killed. Soon after the wolf flees across the Straits of Messina, the queen cries out "or es a leu-garoul penture"[94] ("Now art thou food for the werewolf," 151), the first use of the term "werewolf" in the romance. The wolf hides the child near Rome and does what it can to provide for him. Only after another hundred lines, during which time William is fostered by a cowherd, does the audience

hear about the wolf's background: "Werwolf was he non · wox of kinde, / ac komen was he of kun · þat kud was ful nobul; / For þe kud king of spayne · was kindely his fader" (109-11). In order to ensure that her children would inherit Spain, the king's second wife made an ointment so that "ones well anoynted þe child · well all aboute, / he wex to a werwulf" (136-38). Eventually William is found by the emperor of Rome, thanks to the werewolf. The emperor recognizes William's noble birth and adopts him. Following the romance tradition, William and the emperor's daughter, Melior, fall in love and attempt to escape before she is married off to the prince of Greece. They disguise themselves as bears and run off into the wilderness with no plan for survival.

Fortunately, the werewolf returns and provides for them by using a series of ambushes to scare, steal, then flee from a peasant and clerk who come along the road. After escaping a town, thanks to the werewolf repeating his child-stealing tactic, both lovers remark "now sertes, for soþe, / þis best has mannes kynde · it may be non oþer" (2505-6), finally realizing that this is no normal wolf. Over time, the werewolf returns the lovers to Palerne and the presence of the queen, William's mother, where the wolf petitions for mercy in a scene very reminiscent of Bisclavret's petition to his king. The werewolf remains unnamed until line 4085, where the Spanish king, having come to negotiate a truce since William has beaten his army, relates the story of his first-born son, Alphouns, and how he disappeared. When the king's wife, Braunde, is called to the court, Alphouns attacks her, in a scene very similar to Bisclavret's attack upon his wife and her new husband, before being calmed down. In private, as with Bisclavret, Alphouns is restored to his human form, though Braunde is not punished beyond the

initial attack. Alphouns is dressed, knighted, and revealed so that he can marry William's sister; William marries Melior; the emperor of Rome dies; William inherits Rome as well as Palerne; and everyone is presumably happy.

Like Bisclavret, the werewolf in this romance is "an image of human nature, capable of nobility, but also of irrationality and bestiality."[95] While Hanning and Ferrante direct this characterization at Marie's Bisclavret, it is no less true of Alphouns. The only problematic part of the statement is that the irrational and bestial side of both werewolves is overshadowed by their noble side, to the point that discovering irrationality and/or bestiality in either case is difficult at best. Of the two, bestiality is the easier trait to support. Presumably both Alphouns and Bisclavret had to be bestial to survive in the woods when they were alone. However, in keeping with the *lai* and figure's role in shaping society, the fact that Bisclavret has a noble, human wife can be a civilizing factor. That is, the noble wife has some influence in diminishing the *bisclavret's* animal nature through the requirements attached to their relationship by the courtly love tradition. Ironically, after she strips Bisclavret of the trappings of civilization, she becomes the focus of his bestial acts. Irrationality on the part of either werewolf, on the other hand, is highly debatable. Focusing on Alphouns, the only potentially irrational moments in the romance come when he steals William, when he steals the town provost's son, and when he attacks Braunde. In each of these cases, Alphouns seems to be irrational or bestial on the surface, since the two terms are interchangeable for the medieval audience. However, all three acts have rational, reasoned origins: the first two were used to rescue William from death; the last can be

simply explained away as an act of revenge. In those terms, all three are perfectly rational, human responses. Conversely, Alphouns' nobility is clearly present in both child thefts because he risks himself to save William and Melior. His nobility manifests again in providing for the lovers as they flee and in seeing that William is fostered by the emperor of Rome in the first place. This nobility is recognized near the end of the romance when Braunde requests clothing and the knighting ceremony for her stepson, even though he has not undertaken the traditional knightly training.

The role and placement that Alphouns serves is a clear example of what Bettina Bildhauer and Robert Mills mean when they say "what, on the surface, appears to be marginal may in certain contexts turn out to be symbolically, and ideologically, central."[96] In this case, the romance indicates that William, and consequently Melior, is central to the narrative. Therefore, Alphouns is a minor character, which is borne out by the narrative's focus on following William while Alphouns disappears for long stretches of time. However, without the werewolf, the narrative falls apart. Alphouns drives the plot. He not only brings William and Melior together, but he also pushes them onward as they flee Rome. In fact, like a good dog, he herds them toward William's true homeland, where William's noble birth is revealed, thus allowing him to marry Melior. If the lovers were left to their own devices in their escape, the narrative would end as they have no real plan aside from leaving Rome. They have no idea where to go or how to survive, save that Melior says:

> we schul liue bi oure loue · lelli atte best;
>
> & þur$_3$th þe grace of god · gete vs sumwat elles,

bolaces & blake-beries · þat on breres growen,

so þat for hunger i hope · harm schul we neuer;

hawes, hepus, & hakernes · & þe hasel-notes,

& oþer frut to þe fulle · þat in forest growen;

I seie ȝou, sire, bi mi liif · þis liif so me likes. (1807-13)

Marginally more practical, William replies that he cannot live on such rough food. Displaying his lack of understanding, however, his alternative is to go find some churl and beg for wine and bread, an act that Melior realizes will lead to their immediate capture. To save the pair, the werewolf steps in, acting in the role of the *eiron* or witty/tricky servant of classical drama. In Alphouns, the sympathetic werewolf comes closest to joining Jung's trickster archetype, thanks in no small part to his comic scream-leap-run routine (jumping out from bushes to scare travelers so he can steal their goods), which works well against everyone he meets, from the peasant and clerk to the town provost. Norman Hinton refers to this aspect of the medieval werewolf as the "witty werewolf"[97] that is free of the social constrictions and conventions that bind the other characters.

The third major literary medieval werewolf text also involves characters constrained by their positions. The anonymously authored *Arthur and Gorlagon* is virtually identical to Marie's *Bisclavret*. There are some differences, though, which may have been introduced from Welsh or Irish sources. After Arthur mistakenly kisses Guenivere in public, he sets out with Caius and Walwain to determine the "nature of the heart of a woman."[98] In some ways, this quest is reminiscent of that undertaken by the

knight in Chaucer's *Wife of Bath's Tale*. After searching for some time, Arthur finds three brother kings, the last and eldest being Gorlagon. Gorlagon tells Arthur a story involving a king who owned a sapling that, when broken, could turn people into wolves if they were struck on the head while the striker repeated a simple phrase. Like Bisclavret, the king kept this secret from his wife, who eventually caused him to reveal it. She uses the sapling on her husband, but misquotes the phrase, substituting "and have the understanding of a man" for "and have the understanding of a wolf."[99] She chases him off with his own hounds, and he wanders as a wolf for two years. During that time he has two cubs, and the queen remarries, producing two sons. As a wolf, the king attacks and kills the queen's sons as well as her brother; in retribution his cubs are caught and hanged. For a time after that, the king-wolf attacks livestock and people in his former kingdom before presenting himself to a neighboring king. Otherwise, he acts like Bisclavret. Unlike the king in Marie's *lai*, this neighbor king is married, and his queen is having an affair with the steward, whom the king-wolf attacks before being framed for murdering the king's son. Ultimately, the king recognizes the wolf's humanity, manages to restore his human form, and the king-wolf is revealed to be Gorlagon himself while the neighbor king is his brother.

Save for the sapling branch, the brief scene where Gorlagon becomes a wild, ravaging beast, and the complete absence of any mention of clothing, the tale is effectively the same as Marie's. Like Bisclavret, the king-wolf is wronged and takes out his revenge against the wife and her children, though more violently than his French cousin. Also, like Bisclavret, all of Gorlagon's violent acts can be explained in terms that

are fully understandable to humans—vengeance causes him to attack the wife's sons and brother; his attacks on the livestock and people are caused by grief for his lost cubs—and are therefore less disturbing. However, in Gorlagon's case, the audience is told exactly how and why he became a werewolf, and it is clearly meant as a curse. Because of this cause, and the understandable nature of his acts while in wolf form, Gorlagon easily fits into the sympathetic werewolf tradition, despite being considerably more violent and gory than the other two leading medieval examples. And since the ostensible point of the story is to explain "the nature of the heart of a woman," the author is uses the tale as a means of discussing human nature and social propriety. However, the frame quest is never resolved, Arthur simply "returned home a nine days' journey, marvelling greatly at what he had heard."[100] Although the romance employs the "Loathly Lady" format to begin the narrative, because Arthur is already married, he cannot offer the traditional "Loathly Lady" ending. Thus, the frame narrative is not what is important to the story; rather Gorlagon's tale is the focal story.

## Chivalric Exemplars

The question of social propriety is neither uncommon nor unique to the Arthurian werewolf tale. Rather, it is a common aspect of medieval treatments of the werewolf. As

previously discussed, Gerald's story of the Ossory-Meath werewolves, for instance, has socio-political connotations. Monsters as a broad category act both to question and reify society and social conventions. This simultaneous questioning and supporting of convention is accomplished because the monster and the werewolf provide a warning against breaking social conventions at the same moment in which they break the conventions. They also function as a safe, controlled, and contained outlet, a release valve, for the desire to act outside of social norms, in much the same way that modern sports such as football, wrestling, and paintball provide a release for otherwise socially unacceptable aggression. Williams very broadly suggests this possibility when he notes that "the monster engages at a fundamental level the very principle of order developed in Western thought,"[101] whether the principle underlies medieval or modern society. Put another way, the monster, and therefore the werewolf, in Kratz' words, "represents an unleashing of, or a capitulation to, those powerful non-rational forces which can impel a man to violent and cruel acts that transgress against accepted norms of civilized behavior,"[102] that is, the shadow, and it does so within the relatively safe realm of fiction. Here, in *lais* and romances, the audience can vicariously join the werewolf as it runs in the woods, hunts with wild abandon, and shrugs off the material trappings of society. In the same way, wives in political marriages (as is probably the case in *Arthur and Gorlagon*) can remove their husbands and safely take spouses of their choice, because the unfaithful wife in the story is always punished, for various reasons, as will be discussed below. Alternatively, as is the case in *Bisclavret*, the wife can take a lover to rid herself

of a troublesome, fear inducing, husband. And when the narrative ends, they return to a normal social life, the thrill of the forbidden at least temporarily sated.

One of the other social attractions of the monster, and especially the werewolf, is the removal of the material trappings of society and status. There are certain physically obvious factors that indicate social status in every culture. As many scholars, including John Block Friedman and Francisco Vaz de Silva, have noted, in the Middle Ages these appear as four major categories: clothing, food/diet, speech, and choice of weapons. The first three are still clearly applicable in the early twenty-first century as a glance in any tabloid or fashion magazine will show. Even the last is still present, though much less obvious, as seen in a comparison between a cheap handgun bought on a street corner and a highly decorated, hundred-year-old shotgun resting over a CEO's or president's fireplace.

Clothing plays an important part in most werewolf stories, although in medieval literature the only two tales that directly mention clothing are Gerald's and Marie's. This removal of clothing, according to Vaz de Silva, "stresses the beastly nature—underlying human clothes—of one born to no social position."[103] That is, without the visual indicator presented by clothing, a person's social status is difficult to determine, which undermines the social hierarchy by concluding that the nobleman without his clothing is no better than a churl. Thus, the fact that Bisclavret and Niceros' werewolf need to remove their clothing indicates a simultaneous shedding of social status. Therefore, both also symbolically shed the conventions by which society functions. The Ossory-Meath werewolves in Gerald's story make use of clothing in a rather different way. In their

case, it is the removal of clothing, as the male wolf peels back the she-wolf's skin as if it were a cloak, that reveals the humanity beneath the wolf-skin covering. Clothing functions to determine status with Gerald as it does with the other two, but in this case the clothing indicates animality and the removal, in ironic contrast to the tales by Marie and Petronius, actually raises the hierarchical status of the werewolves from the bestial realm to that of the human. The importance of clothing as a sign of one's place in society is clear, historically, with the introduction of sumptuary laws, such as the 1366 Statue of Kilkenny, which legalized exactly these distinctions.

Friedman presents an excellent discussion of the other trappings of society during the medieval period and states that "an instinctual indicator of social class or national difference is the food that a person eats,"[104] especially in the Middle Ages. The important food distinction for werewolves is that between the common meals of the nobility (the base status of the three most well-known literary werewolves) and game hunted (and eaten uncooked) in the woods. Added to this distinction is the association of werewolves with cannibalism—a problematic issue that refers back to the question of the werewolf's humanity. After all, if the werewolf in wolf shape is really a wolf, then eating humans cannot be cannibalism, but if the werewolf retains its humanity and soul, then eating humans must be cannibalistic. Although, independent of Friedman, this potential problem arises from the links made between diet and questions of the werewolf's humanity, it also appears indirectly in medieval theological discussions of the Eucharist and lycanthropy.

Friedman further states that "[n]early equal in importance to diet as a measure of man was the possession of speech."[105] Without the capacity for speech, the individual could not take part in medieval society. The system of early fief contracts required the use of oral oaths of fealty and protection. Speech was also necessary for the transmission of information, whether it be reports from the borders of a noble's lands or passing on a tale, in a largely pre-literate society. As Jorgensen explains, "Linguistic structure was the basis for medieval social identity, the swearing of oaths the glue of political and military relationships,"[106] without which the social structure collapses. Despite lacking this ability, as has been previously shown, most of the werewolves in question manage to find other means of communication, as necessitated by the plots of their narratives, thus displaying their humanity.

The fourth means of determining humanity, and social acceptance, is also illustrated by Friedman, in the choice of weapons possessed by the individual. Amongst humans, the choice of a means to defend oneself, especially in the eras before firearms, creates a clear class distinction. The upper classes, the civilized ones, during the Middle Ages bore swords, maces, and other chivalric/mounted weapons.[107] The lower classes, just above the animals and monsters, used whatever was close at hand, from pruning hooks to spears to the oft-depicted pitchforks. Those who either used no weapons to defend themselves—relying instead on claws, teeth, and/or fists—or employed a club or stave made up the non-human or sub-human level of the social/biological hierarchy. In each literary case, Bildhauer and Mills contend that the monster acted to continue to help "identify the very concept of courtliness"[108] by delineating diet, dress, behavior, and

speech. Therefore, for a knight such as Bisclavret or a potential knight like Alphouns, giving up or losing his ability to wield a chivalric weapon by physically becoming a wolf represents a loss of status, both in society and in the biological hierarchy. Both cases also involve the loss and eventual resumption of their positions, which is at least partially governed by Fortune.

Such changes of Fortune—both losses and gains—are certainly not limited to the individual. Implicit in the medieval fascination with Fortune is the idea that change is an inevitable fact of existence. Shape-changing figures, especially the werewolf, represent, and are used to explain, real biological, social, and psychological changes. Here, the important change is social and, as Bynum has succinctly stated, a changing society "entails anxiety—a need for limits."[109] There should be no surprise, then, that the periods of medieval history entailing a resurgence of written werewolf stories are the transitional twelfth and fourteenth centuries. In both eras, cultural change was a continuous process either from the earlier combative court to the courtly love tradition to the aftermath of the Hundred Years War or, in the late fourteenth century, recovery from the devastating Black Death. Both of these periods show the basic fact that people, societies, and institutions change, evolve, and adapt over time. Likewise, the werewolf narratives that are about "process, *mutatio*, story"[110] deal with change and adaptation, as amply displayed by both Bisclavret and Alphouns in their attempts to communicate with the humans around them.

As with all monsters, note Bildhauer and Mills, these werewolves "embody cultural tensions that go beyond the idea of monster as uninhabitable, unintelligible

'Other.'"[111] They display a cultural need for boundary-crossing figures that can reinforce new and old definitions even as society enters a phase of change that is simultaneously frightening and attracting. In this role, the werewolves' traits—"the ability to rage insensate through the countryside wreaking havoc, the separation from established social company—these apply as much to the rebel knights as they do to the werewolf."[112] Although Holton discusses this statement in relation to knights who rebel against their lords, it is equally applicable to knights living in the transition period between the purely warrior-knight and the (at least theoretical) adoption of the courtly love tradition, that emphasized skills beyond those used on the battlefield. We should note that save for one or two moments each, neither Bisclavret nor Alphouns resorts to real violence during his time in wolf form. Moreover, neither they nor Gorlagon actually go so far as to kill the wife/stepmother who trapped them, as they may have done under previous (Anglo-Saxon, Gaulish, or Norse) vengeance traditions. Instead, the punishments, at least for Bisclavret and Alphouns, come through the legal system as represented by their respective kings. In those two cases, the full stories come through that system as well since both Bisclavret's wife and Braunde are brought to testify before the king. Gorlagon too, a king himself, shows some restraint in punishing his wife, even if her punishment—being forced to hold and kiss the decapitated head of her executed lover—is a gruesome one.

These manifestations of the medieval werewolf archetype serve to construct and modify society, but, as Barkan notes, "[m]etamorphosis is an outward sign that the ties that bind [society and individuals] have been loosed."[113] In all three cases, the bonds in question are those that provide the foundation of medieval society: wife-husband or

child-parent. Both Gorlagon and Bisclavret are trapped in their wolf forms because of a failed wife-husband bond. Alphouns is caught up in a different, though closely related, failed relationship, that of the child and parent, or step-parent in his case. These two relationships are important in the medieval context because they provide the basis for the lord-vassal bond. Because the foundational private bond has failed, the larger social bond—the private bond's mirror image—has consequently failed. Thus, as Sayers states, "the werewolf, whether a shape-shifter or transformed by a malevolent external power, can be viewed as an exile from both human form and human society."[114] The stories' clearest purposes in this context are to question whether the knight/prince/king can maintain the bonds expected of him by society as lord and vassal if he cannot maintain more basic bonds of family.

In all three cases, though, prior oaths of fealty and fidelity are re-sworn and the normal bonds of lord and vassal return, even to the point of the emergency knighting of a prince. Save for Braunde, the wives are punished for subverting society while their ex-husbands are rewarded. However, according to Jorgensen, for a time the audience is shown the fragility of their society because "[i]ts stability is contingent upon its members' respect for their moral obligations."[115] This is where the werewolf tale presents and attempts to deal with a tension caused by the rise of the courtly love tradition.

This tension is created by the dual bonds of feudal oaths and, during the twelfth century, all of the bonds associated with the rise of the courtly love tradition. According to Michelle Freeman, both *Bisclavret* and *Arthur and Gorlagon* feature noblewomen who

manage to exercise power over their husbands "by exploiting their fealty to a chivalric code of love service."[116] They use these bonds to wheedle information out of the husbands. After acquiring the necessary information, they further exploit this fealty in order to manipulate their chosen lovers to rescind their feudal oaths. The question is enhanced in Bisclavret's case because the lover-knight technically has the added requirement to uphold his feudal oaths to the king by removing a monstrous, potential threat to the kingdom (namely the *bisclavret*). By exploiting the code implicit in the courtly love tradition, both noblewomen highlight the tension that exists between the social oaths and courtly love requirements. This same problematic tension appears in Malory's Arthurian tales and Beroul's *Romance of Tristan*, with Lancelot and Tristan torn between feudal obligations to their king and love service obligations to their queens, although Beroul employs a magic potion (standing in for Marie's "monster") to create this tension. Ultimately, in the case of Bisclavret, as Bruckner argues, "the love shared by lord and vassal, interrupted by Bisclavret's year in the forest, finds a truer, more stable basis when the werewolf's dual nature is no longer a secret."[117] In this way, the dual nature of man and wolf mirrors the dual nature of the individual as lord and husband. The same is arguably the case with Alphouns, although, since the audience lacks any useful information about his relationship with his father-king before he was transformed, this connection is difficult to support.

Even at their most bestial moments, these three werewolves—Bisclavret, Alphouns, and Gorlagon—show themselves to be both products and reifiers of society and its conventions. The moments in question are their attacks upon the former wife,

step-mother, and brother's steward, respectively. Although these scenes have been discussed by modern critics in various ways, they can all be understood in terms of feudal society as both acceptable and necessary punishments. For either Bisclavret or Gorlagon, as Bruckner contends, his "*rage* is not that of a werewolf; it is the understandably human and feudal desire for vengeance, the appropriate punishment of his wife's betrayal."[118] The nameless wise man puts this violence into perspective for Bisclavret's audience, which serves to show the audience and the court that the man-beast before them can make a rational distinction between friend and enemy, good and evil. William fulfills this role for Alphouns, while Gorlagon has to serve as both misunderstood actor and interpreter for himself. Several modern scholars, including Michelle Freeman, have noted that Bisclavret's attack upon his former wife mirrors a punishment reserved for traitors: the removal of the nose. Through this act and explanation, the audience can see, as Joseph Pappa says, "Bisclavret's monstrous status is *subsumed* by his status as feudal subject to the king. The werewolf never stops performing 'human.'"[119] This assertion is equally applicable to Alphouns in that he constantly acts like a prince and knight in his dealings with William and Melior, something that Braunde apparently recognizes in her call for his knighting ceremony. Rather than being social outcasts because of their so-called bestial acts, all three werewolves show that they acted in the best interests of one or more kingdoms, and therefore their acts are, to cite Kerry Shea, "rehabilitated into the realm of social acceptability."[120]

## Lycanthrope in Transition

As we can see from the preceding discussion, the medieval werewolf was a socially paradoxical figure with two major (and many minor) competing traditions at work, the earlier of the two being the religious, monstrous tradition where the werewolf served as a sign of demonic involvement and illusory trickery. By the twelfth century, a parallel literary tradition began, one that depicted the werewolf as a sympathetic figure for the audience to identify with. Both traditions deployed the werewolf archetype for similar purposes. As shown above, theologians and authors made use of the man-wolf in order, primarily, to discuss definitions of humanity and to influence society. In the former case, the ecclesiastical writers use the werewolf as an example of negative traits, that is, what happens to society when the rules are disobeyed. The literary writers, on the other side of the coin, use the werewolf as an exemplar of good, proper, social behavior. Despite their differences in methods and use, both types of medieval authors come to very similar conclusions regarding definitions of humanity—use of clothing, diet, possession of reason and speech—even if they come to different conclusions regarding the status of the werewolf in the man-beast dichotomy. As will be shown later, this tension of parallel traditions will resurface in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, after being shifted to geographical differences during the early modern period.

[1] David Williams, *Deformed Discourse: The Function of the Monster in Mediaeval Thought and Literature* (Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's UP, 1999) 123-4.
[2] Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, "Monster Theory (Seven Theses)," *Monster Theory: Reading Culture,* ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (Minneapolis, Minn.: U of Minnesota P, 1996) 6.
[3] Caroline Walker Bynum, "Metamorphosis, or Gerald and the Werewolf," *Metamorphosis and Identity*, ed. Caroline Walker Bynum (New York: Zone Books, 2005) 84.
[4] There is a brief passage in *The Epic of Gilgamesh* that described a man turning into a wolf. Ovid's tale of Lycaon comes from earlier Greek sources, likely another reference to the cult of Lykaian Zeus. Augustine also references Greek sources when he discusses the Arcadians.
[5] Pausanias, *The Description of Greece*, n.t. (London: Richard Priestly, 1824) 96.
[6] Adam Douglas, *The Beast Within: A History of the Werewolf* (New York: Avon, 1992) 73.
[7] Virgil, "Eclogue VIII," *Eclogues*, trans. H. R. Fairclough (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard UP, 1916). Available online at: http://www.theoi.com/Text/VirgilEclogues.html
[8] Petronius, *The Satyricon*, trans. J. P. Sullivan (New York: Penguin Classics, 1979)
[9] Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. Rolfe Humphries (Indiana UP, 1983) 10.
[10] Harold Skulsky, *Metamorphosis: The Mind in Exile* (Harvard UP, 1981) 25-7.
[11] Leonard Barkan, *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis & the Pursuit of Paganism* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1986) 21.
[12] Ibid. 69.
[13] Skulsky 36.
[14] Barkan 29.
[15] Ibid. 91.
[16] Joyce E. Salisbury, *The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages* (New York: Routledge, 1994) 86.
[17] Cohen 13.
[18] Daniel Javitch, "Rescuing Ovid from the Allegorizers," *Comparative Literature*. 30 (1978): 101.
[19] Jeffry A. Massey, "*Corpus Lupi*: The Medieval Werewolf and Popular Theology," diss., Emory U, 2003, 78.
[20] See Caroline Walker Bynum, *Metamorphosis and Identity* (New York: Zone, 2001) and Jeffry A. Massey, "*Corpus Lupi*: The Medieval Werewolf and Popular Theology," diss., Emory U, 2003.
[21] Massey 100.
[22] Bynum 94.
[23] Montague Summers, *The Werewolf in Lore and Legend* (1933; Mineola, NY: Dover, 2003) 65.
[24] Jean Jorgensen, "The Lycanthropy Metaphor in Marie de France's *Bisclavret*," *Selecta: Journal of the PNCFL* (1994): 24.
[25] Summers 187.
[26] Ibid. 65.
[27] See Jeremiah 5.6, Ezekiel 22.27, Matthew 10.16, John 10.12, and Acts 20.29 as examples.
[28] The biblical references use: *The Oxford Annotated Bible,* ed. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger (New York: Oxford UP, 1962).
[29] Summers 66.
[30] Jorgensen 24.

[31] Joyce Salisbury, "Human Animals of Medieval Fables," *Animals in the Middle Ages*, ed. Nona C. Flores (New York: Garland Publishing, 1996) 53.
[32] For more on fief-holding and the social role of nobles, see Constance Brittain Bouchard, *"Strong of Body, Brave and Noble": Chivalry and Society in Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998) 28-46.
[33] Salisbury, *Beast* 130.
[34] Both Summers and Baring-Gould include brief discussions of these transformations, as does James I in his treatise on demons and witchcraft.
[35] Albert the Great, *Man and the Beasts (De animalibus, books 22-26),* trans. James J. Scanlan (Binghampton, N.Y.: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1987) 156.
[36] Ibid. 157.
[37] Other possibilities include the tradition of the spirit leaving the body to roam the world as a wolf at night, combined with the classical and later tradition of people undergoing the metamorphosis after bathing in a pool or lake, possibly reflecting the moon. And Gervase of Tilbury directly connects the werewolf's transformation to the full moon, an idea that other medieval writers, both literary and otherwise, do not appear to have shared.
[38] T. H. White, trans., *The Bestiary: A Book of Beasts* (New York: Capricorn Books, 1960) 56.
[39] Ibid. 56.
[40] Ibid. 58.
[41] Ibid. 59.
[42] See Bynum and Jeffry Massey above (n 20).
[43] White 60.
[44] Salisbury, *Beast* 4.
[45] Massey 10.
[46] Dennis M. Kratz, "*Fictus Lupus*: The Werewolf in Christian Thought," *Classical Folia* 30.1 (1976): 62.
[47] Ibid. 67-8.
[48] Ibid. 68.
[49] These are the various species said to be living beyond Persia, named for the Roman historian Pliny. They include giants, cynocephali, and blemmyae and were popular subjects in travel narratives, such as John Mandeville's *Travels*, at least until the middle of the early modern period.
[50] For a related argument involving the Mass and vampires, see: Timothy K. Beal, *Religion and its Monsters* (New York: Routledge, 2002).
[51] Kratz 78.
[52] Albert 66.
[53] Ibid. 66.
[54] Ibid. 66.
[55] Ibid. 65.
[56] Ibid. 65.
[57] Saint Augustine, *The City of God*, trans. Marcus Dods (New York: Modern Library, 1993) 16.8.
[58] Caroline Walker Bynum, "Introduction: Change in the Middle Ages," *Metamorphosis and Identity*, ed. Caroline Walker Bynum (New York: Zone Books, 2005) 26.
[59] John Carey, "Werewolves in Medieval Ireland," *Cambrian Celtic Medieval Studies* 44 (Winter 2002): 56.

[60] Massey points out that "In an age of bestiaries and wonders, Christian scholars such as Augustine and Aquinas repeatedly denied the possibility of werewolf existence on theological grounds: only God can transubstantiate, only Christ is consubstantiate" (12-13). This implies that there was something present in werewolves that was not present in other monsters/wonders, something the writers feared, such as temptation to heresy.
[61] Augustine 18.17.
[62] Ibid. 18.18.
[63] Massey 60.
[64] Bynum, "Introduction." 23.
[65] Barkan 97.
[66] See Leslie Dunton-Downer, "Wolf Man," *Becoming Male in the Middle Ages*, eds. Jeffrey J. Cohen and Bonnie Wheeler (New York: Garland, 2000) 203-18.
[67] Gerald of Wales, *The History and Topography of Ireland*, trans. John J. O'Meara (New York: Penguin, 1988) 70.
[68] Gerald 71.
[69] For more on this subject, see Salisbury (13-76).
[70] Massey 111.
[71] Another interesting point is that John Carey states that "According to at least one of our sources [. . .] the werewolves of Ossory are none other than that region's rulers" who use their powers to terrorize their neighbors (57).
[72] Carey. 64.
[73] Rhonda Knight, "Werewolves, Monsters, and Miracles: Representing Colonial Fantasies in Gerald of Wales's *Topographia Hibernica*," *Studies in Iconography* 22 (2001): 55-86.
[74] Salisbury, *Beast* 87.
[75] See Salisbury, *Beast* and Bynum, "Metamorphosis."
[76] Edith Benkov, "The Naked Beast: Clothing and Humanity in Bisclavret," *Chimeres* 19.2 (1998): 27-43.
[77] Barkan 35-6.
[78] All *Bisclavret* quotes come from: Marie de France, "Bisclavret," *The Lais of Marie de France*, trans. Robert Hanning and Joan Ferrante (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002)
[79] Benkov. 28. See also Kathryn Holton, "Metamorphosis and Language in the Lay of Bisclavret," *In Quest of Marie de France, a Twelfth-Century Poet*, ed. Chantal E. Maréchal (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1992); Brian J. Frost, *The Essential Guide to Werewolf Literature* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2003); and Joseph Pappa, "The Bewildering Bounded/Bounding Bisclavret, or Lycanthropy, Lieges, and a Lotta Leeway in Marie de France," *Crossings* 4 (2000): 117-143.
[80] "Although the lai allows the hero to be a werewolf, it is never forgotten that a werewolf is a loathsome thing, and that any noble knight would be desperately ashamed of having been one, no matter how innocently the transformation came about." Douglas 115.
[81] Matilda Tomaryn Bruckner, "Of Men and Beasts in *Bisclavret*," *Romantic Review* 82.3 (1991): 261.
[82] Kirby Smith, "An Historical Study of the Werwolf in Literature," *PMLA* 9 (1894): 13.
[83] Frank Hamel, *Human Animals* (London: Frederick A Stokes Co., 1915) 9.
[84] Bruckner 261.
[85] All three: H. W. Bailey, "*Bisclavret* in Marie de France," *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 1 (1981) 96.

[86] William Sayers, "*Bisclavret* in Marie de France: a Reply," *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 4 (1982) 77-82.
[87] Ibid. 81.
[88] Holton 195.
[89] Bruckner 256.
[90] Ibid. 259.
[91] Williams 124.
[92] Caroline Walker Bynum, "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?" *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*, ed. Caroline Walker Bynum (Berkeley: U. of California P, 1982) 86.
[93] Ibid. 85.
[94] All *William of Palerne* quotes come from Walter W. Skeat, ed., *The Romance of William of Palerne* (1867; London: Elibron Classics, 2005)
[95] Hanning and Ferrante 102.
[96] Bettina Bildhauer and Robert Mills, "Introduction," *The Monstrous Middle Ages* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003) 6.
[97] Norman Hinton, "The Werewolf as *Eiron*: Freedom and Comedy in *William of Palerne*," *Animals in the Middle Ages*, ed. Nona C. Flores (New York : Routledge, 1996) 134.
[98] Frank A. Milne, trans., "Arthur and Gorlagon," *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*, ed. Charlotte F. Otten (New York: Dorset Press, 1989) 234.
[99] Ibid. 239.
[100] Ibid. 250.
[101] Williams 14.
[102] Kratz 58.
[103] Francisco Vaz de Silva, *Metamorphosis: The Dynamics of Symbolism in European Fairy Tales* (New York: Lang, 2002) 45.
[104] John Block Friedman, *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1981)
[105] Ibid. 29.
[106] Jorgensen 28.
[107] Chivalry in this case following Constance Bouchard's definition as "a form of behavior knights and nobles would have liked to imagine they followed, both based on and reflected in the epics and romances, a form of behavior which took armed and mounted combat as one of its key elements" (104).
[108] Bildhauer and Mills 11.
[109] Bynum, "Introduction." 27.
[110] Ibid. 30.
[111] Bildhauer and Mills 22.
[112] Holton 203.
[113] Barkan 66.
[114] Sayers 80.
[115] Jorgensen 29.
[116] Michelle Freeman, "Dual Natures and Subverted Glosses: Marie de France's 'Bisclavret,'" *Romance Notes* 25 (Spring 1985): 288-301.
[117] Bruckner 263.
[118] Ibid. 262.
[119] Pappa 120.

[120] Kerry Shea, "Male Bonding, Female Body: The Absenting of Woman in Bisclaretz," *Cold Counsel: Women in Old Norse Literature and Mythology*, ed. Sarah M. Anderson (New York: Routledge, 2000) 250.

# CHAPTER 2

## Monstrous Anti-Wolf

> Terrible monsters are impressive exactly because they break the rules and do what humans can only imagine and dream of. Since they observe no limits, respect no boundaries, and attack and kill without compunction, monsters are also the spirit that says "Yes" to all that is forbidden. (David Gilmore, 2003)[1]

### Metamorphosis Evolves

Views of the werewolf changed as European culture metamorphosed during the transition from the medieval to early modern periods. The most important change that occurred was the virtual disappearance of the "real" werewolf from literature. Although early modern authors continued to depict shape-shifters (most famously in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* and Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *The Tempest*) werewolves effectively vanish. This is not to say that the figure entirely disappears from

the early modern period. Rather, during this era the term "lycanthropy" refers both to what Brett Hirsh calls the "*reality* of the werewolf"[2] and the delusions brought on by madness. Discussions of the werewolf in popular culture join with theological and demonological approaches in discourses on witchcraft that appeared on the Continent. At the same time, English and Scottish authors began using lycanthropy as a form of madness. Even so, the werewolf managed to retain at least some literary and cultural currency, even if the sympathetic werewolf and literal werewolf of the Middle Ages seem completely to disappear.

In order fully to treat early modern approaches to the werewolf, we must look not only at the few literary sources, but also at records of witch trials and both theological and demonological treatises produced during the period. When we do, we find that three major positions or uses of werewolves appear during the period. The first is connected to the conflation of lycanthropy and witchcraft, which saw the werewolf as a demonic monster and produced a debate about whether witches could also be werewolves. The second is the scholarly (and to some extent theological) position that lycanthropy was a mental disorder, typically associated with melancholy or choler. The third, which appears most often as the man who acts wolfish or the wolf who acts like a man, hearkens back to medieval fables in which the werewolf was a metaphor for cultural and personal behavior, tied to the early modern concept of self-fashioning. In this last point, the werewolf both undermines and supports John Lamb's assertion that "our nature is never 'willingly chosen'; self is always a social construct."[3]

## Witches, Demons, and Wolves

Although both Continental and English/Scottish Europeans appear to have shared similar views of and uses for werewolves throughout the medieval period, their views diverged over the course of the fourteenth century. By the fifteenth, sixteenth, and especially the seventeenth centuries, there is a sharp divide between Continental and English views regarding werewolves. The sympathetic werewolf on the Continent vanished. Due to a combination of wolf attacks upon humans, a serious fear of rabies, and a conflation of werewolves with witches, the werewolf largely exited Continental entertainment literature (or at least it seems to abandon what could be termed purely entertainment literature while remaining present in broadsides and treatises on witchcraft and demonology). As a representative example of Continental views, in his study of sixteenth-century Lorraine witch trials, Robin Briggs discovered that "[w]olves appear in thirty-six of these [cases], although not always with any implication that they were werewolves."[4] These cases accounted for roughly ten percent of the Lorraine cases, more than any other animal. According to Briggs, wolves were much more common in neighboring Franche-Compté narratives. Maia Madar adds that in Estonia, "Belief in werewolves was widespread. At eighteen trials, eighteen women and thirteen men were accused of causing damage while werewolves."[5] Unlike most other contemporary

accounts, these latter transformations were believed to be literal transformations: according to trial records, the subjects were believed to be beasts, not humans, while changed.

Demonologists on the Continent were fascinated with the mechanics of transformation and apparent transformation. I use "apparent transformation" here because, amongst clergymen and demonologists, there was still doctrinal disbelief in real transformation from human to animal forms owing to Augustine's argument. Accounts of werewolves almost invariably involve some mechanical means of changing form, or appearing to do so, typically by means of such medieval holdovers as ointments and wolfskins. Bathing in pools (a common southern European method) largely vanishes as a means of effecting change, perhaps in part because it lacks the necessary compact with a demon or Satan, which is an integral element to Continental reports of werewolves after the fifteenth century. Interestingly, for modern audiences raised on horror movies, Jane Davidson notes that "there are no cases of persons having been 'infected' with lycanthropy through the bite of, or physical attack of, another werewolf recorded in the period of the fifteenth through the seventeenth centuries."[6] Once again, because such a means of transmission would lack the actively sinning participation of the werewolf-to-be, it would undermine the integral Satanic compact.

An additional point of interest is that at the same time that demonologists and theologians connected lycanthropy to witchcraft (in that nearly all witchcraft treatises have at least a few sentences about lycanthropy), they argued over the relative status of werewolves and witches. As Davidson states, "[f]rom the late fifteenth through

seventeenth centuries, witchcraft authorities debated whether witches could also be werewolves. Others thought witches transformed themselves into wolves, but did not become werewolves themselves."[7] Given that not all accused werewolves were also accused of being witches, the crucial point of definition was often whether the creature caused harm to humans. In some cases, these witch transformations were effected merely to act as beasts of burden for each other. The demonological obsession with lycanthropic transformation's mechanics and limits reveals a strong connection with teratology in that, according to Norman Smith, the monster, and werewolf, "then, though it differs from the normal, nevertheless conforms to natural and understandable laws."[8] Although Satanic power and compacts with demons certainly straddle the border between the natural and unnatural they were understandable and did follow certain commonly definable patterns, insofar as the early modern audiences were concerned.

Even as religious and demonological leaders—such as Adams, Boguet, Kramer and Sprenger—were tying lycanthropy to witchcraft, theologians were deploying the figure in metaphorical terms. In every known theological case, whether connected to witches or not, the werewolf becomes a monster. For instance, in one of Thomas Adams' sermons in 1630, lycanthropes were discussed as mystical wolves who come in the shapes of men with wolf-like minds to steer the faithful away from the proverbial flock. Likewise, as Erica Fudge observes, the "werewolf is a logical extension of the doggish unbeliever and in its acts of violence it likewise reveals two dangerous possibilities for a descent from the human to the animal,"[9] that is, the total loss of conscience and violence as an integral part of the human conscience. Initially, reason (as opposed to instinctive

responses) was held as the division between man and other animals, as discussed in the previous chapter. But by 1637 textual speech replaced the medieval view of conscience as the site of humanity, just as conscience replaced reason during the mid- to late-Middle Ages.[10] Because many animal actions have reasoned origins, eventually conscience—the ability to discern between good and evil—replaced reason and was tied to questions of the soul. Textual speech—the ability to read and/or write—became the dividing point between man and beast.

Of the various accounts of werewolves and witches that made their way into England during this period, four stand out as representative samples: Stubbe Peeter's trial (1590, translated into English after a mere eight months), Jean Grenier's trial (1603), the (in)famous *Malleus Maleficarum* of Heinrich Kramer and James Sprenger (1486-87), and Henri Boguet's "Of the Metamorphosis of Men into Beasts" (1590). These accounts represent a sample of Continental werewolf discussions that acquired some currency in early modern England All four texts relate directly to the conflation of tales of witchcraft and werewolves, and they also present Continental views regarding werewolves and the mechanics of such transformations.

According to the trial record of Stubbe Peeter, the accused werewolf was transformed "into the likeness of a greedy, devouring wolf"[11] via a girdle given to him through a pact with the Devil. Peeter then used this shape to commit murders, to "ravish" women as a human and then kill them as a wolf:

> He had at that time living a faire yong Damosell to his Daughter, after whom he also lusted most unnaturallye, and cruellye committed most wicked inceste with

her, a most groce and vilde sinne, far surmounting Adultrye or Fornication, though the least of the three dooth drive the soule into hellfier, except hartye repentance, and the great mercy of God. This Daughter of his he begot when he was not altogether so wickedlye given, who was called by the name of Stubbe Beell, whose beautye and good grace was such as deserved commendacions of all those that knewe her: And such was his inordinate lust and filthye desire toward her, that he begat a Childe by her, dayly using her as his Concubine, but as an insaciate and filthy beast, given over to woork evil, with greedines he also lay by his owne Sister, frequenting her company long time even according as the wickednes of his hart lead him: Moreover being on a time sent for to a Gossip of his there to make merry and good cheere, ere he thence departed he so wunne the woman by his faire and flattering speech, and so much prevailed, yet ere he departed the house: he lay by her, and ever after had her companye at his commaund, this woman had to name Katherine Trompin, a woman of tall and comely stature of exceeding good favour and one that was well esteemed among her neighbours. But his lewde and inordinat lust being not satisfied with the company of many Concubines, nor his wicked fancye contented with the beauty of any woman, at length the devill sent unto him a wicked spirit in the similitude and likenes of a woman, so faire of face and comlye of personage, that she resembled rather some heavenly Hellin than any mortall creature, so farre her beauty exceeded the choisest sorte of women, and with her as with his harts delight, he kept company the space of seven yeares, though in the end she proved

> and was found indeed no other than a she Devil, not withstanding, this lewd sinne of lecherye did not any thing asswage his cruell and bloody minde, but continuing an insatiable bloodsucker, so great was the joye he took therein, that he accounted no day spent in pleasure wherein he had not shed some blood not respecting so much who he did murder, as how to murder and destroy them, as the matter ensuing dooth manifest, which may stand for a speciall note of a cruell and hard hart. For having a proper youth to his sonne, begotten in the flower and strength of his age, the firste fruite of his bodye, in whome he took such joye, that he did commonly call him his Hartes ease, yet so farre his delight in murder exceeded the joye he took in his onle Sonne, that thirsting after his blood, on a time he inticed him into the feeldes, and from thence into the forrest hard by, where making excuse to stay about the necessaries of nature, while the yong man went on forward, incontinent in the shape and likenes of a Wolfe, he encountered his owne Sonne, and there most cruelly slewe him, which doon, he presently eat the brains out of his head as a most saverie and dainty delycious meane to staunch his greedye apetite: the most monstrous act that ever man heard off, for never was knowen a wretch from nature so far degenerate.[12]

Under the threat of torture, Peeter confessed to all the charges and was eventually executed as a sorcerer and witch before being burned, as were his daughter and "Gossip" (the record is unclear as to this woman's status).

This trial expands upon the link between werewolves and transgressive sexuality identified by Gerald of Wales. Through Peeter's trial record, the werewolf becomes

associated not only with bestiality, but also with incest (both with his daughter and sister) which produces offspring. As noted, this particular crime is referred to as "far surmounting Adultrye or Fornication, though the least of the three dooth drive the soule into hellfier."[13] There may even be the implication of homosexual, incestuous rape in the phrase "he encountered his owne Sonne."[14] However, the last would not follow Peeter's pattern in that he is said to be in "the shape and likenes of a Wolfe"[15] during this encounter. The specific mention of Peeter's shape contradicts the sexualized interpretation of "encountered" because Peeter's pattern throughout the trial account is to rape while in human shape and kill in wolf shape. That said, the cannibalism linked to transgressive sexuality through Peeter anticipates the violent incestuous desire/acts that later appear in John Ford's *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* and their connection to the werewolf provides a clear link to John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*. This becomes important because Peeter's trial is not only the most horrific Continental werewolf trial to appear in England, but it is archetypal in that it is a template for later accounts.

The Peeter account contains all the important elements that occur in nearly every other werewolf or witch trial: a pact with Satan; some mechanical means of transforming or otherwise causing chaos and destruction; multiple murders and rapes; the court's attempt to protect "young children" and "goodly young women"; demon summoning; torture; and execution. As S. J. Wiseman comments, this account of the trial shows that "the wolf shape compromises the human status of the shape changer so that only after his return to human form can he recognize and repent of the atrocities he committed."[16] Despite the claim that he was caught in wolf form, if Peeter was executed in that shape,

he would have no chance to repent since the wolf cannot, theologically, contain a soul. Therefore, he had to be tried and executed in his human shape so he had a chance of forgiveness and salvation.

Jean Grenier's case is very similar to Peeter, although with some different details. According to a girl in a nearby village, he said that "he had sold himself to the devil, and that he had acquired the power of ranging the country after dusk, and sometimes in broad day, in the form of a wolf [. . .] he had killed and devoured many dogs, but that he found their flesh less palatable than the flesh of little girls, which he regarded as a supreme delicacy."[17] He claimed that one Pierre Labourant, who lives "in a place of gloom and fire, where there are many companions, some seated on iron chairs, burning, burning"[18] gave him a wolf skin and the ability to effect this transformation. Labourant is meant to be a devil of some sort, based on his home. Grenier was taught to strip, anoint himself with a salve, and wear a wolf skin to change his form. He claimed that he attacked children at his master's (Satan's) command and that he had done so for two or three years. What stands out about this account is that Grenier was a mere thirteen years old. Perhaps because of his youth, the president of the assize in which he was tried stated "Lycanthropy and Kuanthropy were mere hallucinations, and that the change of shape existed only in the disorganized brain of the insane, consequently it was not a crime which could be punished."[19] After this unusual but enlightened statement, quite possibly the only one like it recorded on the Continent, he sentenced Grenier to imprisonment in a monastery, where the boy died seven years later.

Davidson asserts that the sense that is produced by the conflated werewolf-witch cases is that when the acts of rape, murder, and cannibalism linked to such cases are performed by werewolves, "those deeds seem to have been made more awful due to the transmutation of the individuals into animals."[20] This sense becomes more apparent through the increase in the number of murders attributed to the accused, especially the inclusion of the murder of pregnant young women. The detail of horrific description present in these accounts, especially that of Stubbe Peeter, indicates a point of transition in that the format becomes pseudo-scientific and legalistic. Both characteristics lend a moral neutrality or amorality to the accounts. This sense of presentation from an amoral perspective allows far greater detail regarding the morally reprehensible acts described in each account.

Moreover, werewolf trials are generally associated with regions where mass murders appear, connecting the bestial wolf side to the acts as a means of separating the human from the horrifying acts. In contrast to this is the subtext present in Peeter's trial, that is, since Peeter can be tried and found guilty of acts committed while he wears the shape of a wolf, the trial reveals, in Fudge's words, "the sense in which the human remains human even when undergoing metamorphosis: identity, in some fundamental way, is not altered."[21] This idea returns us once more to St. Augustine. In the case of this and other trials, identity has to remain unaltered. If the accused's identity is changed by the transformation, if he (and werewolves are still mostly males in the early modern period) becomes an animal in spirit/mind as well as body, he cannot be held legally responsible for his actions. Moreover, he cannot direct his actions against those who

have supposedly wronged him, thereby weakening the case of the witch/werewolf hunters. However, the assize president's statement in Grenier's case clearly states that the lycanthrope has no control over his actions and, therefore, cannot be punished, even if Grenier is effectively punished through his imprisonment. This result is comparable to being declared innocent by reason of insanity in a modern court.

Both accounts involve an implied or overt threat directed toward children. In Grenier's case, this comes in his claim regarding the flesh of girls. The account never directly states that he ever actually attacked or ate any girls, but implies that he had done so in the past through his claims. Peeter's trial approaches this issue through the charges that he "murdered thirteen yong Children, and two goodly yong women bigge with Child, tearing the Chidlren out of their wombes"[22] as well as the aforementioned acts of incest regarding his daughter and the murder of his own son. This particular aspect of lycanthropic violence reoccurs with Ferdinand's threats toward his sister's children (Webster) and Greyback's favored choice of targets (Rowling).

The perspective of both the Peeter and Grenier accounts is that of the secretary recording the trial. Henri Boguet's "Of the Metamorphosis of Men into Beasts" (1590) explains werewolf trials from the perspective of the witch/werewolf hunter. Referring to several French trials, Boguet states that at least four of the accused individuals "confessed that they had turned themselves into wolves and that, in this shape, they had killed several children"[23] and eaten part of each victim. To support his assertion that werewolves exist, Boguet cites the Arcadians, Virgil, and Ovid's Lycaon. According to this successful werewolf/witch hunter, any wolf that exhibits strange behavior, lacks a

tail, or is excessively large could be a werewolf. He states that all werewolves eat men and share wounds between their forms, a common trait associated with lycanthropes in the period. Beyond werewolves, Boguet also notes that both God and witches have turned people into cats, asses, pigs, horses, oxen, and frogs, citing biblical evidence and witch trials throughout the Continent as his sources.[24]

When he attempts to discuss the mechanics of these transformations, Boguet is unsure about what exactly happens. Initially, he states that "it has always been my opinion that Lycanthropy is an illusion, and that the metamorphosis of a man into a beast is impossible. For it would necessitate one of two things:—either the man who is changed into a beast must keep his soul and power of reasons, or he must lose this at the moment of metamorphosis."[25] But later, Boguet states that neither option can work.[26] The first requires that an animal body contain a soul and reason, which the Church denied. The second implies that the Devil can perform miracles, another major point that the Church was loathe to approve. However, Boguet also states that he believes Satan sometimes puts witches to sleep, acts as a wolf, then confuses the witch's memory into thinking that (s)he was the wolf. Boguet gives more weight to the belief that a witch runs around believing (s)he is a wolf due to the Devil's illusions. Illusion and self-delusion have to be the means for transformation in Boguet's construct because he has already denied real metamorphosis and he further denies psychic lycanthropy, stating that it is impossible for the body to survive without the soul. Once again, according to Boguet's theory, Satan either has to produce illusions or, more problematic, miracles.

Kramer and Sprenger's *The Malleus Maleficarum* (1486-87, translated into English in 1584) mentions werewolves only briefly. The text, quite possibly the most famous witchcraft treatise in Europe, was probably one of Boguet's sources for his own theories. Most of the classic werewolf trial elements are present in their brief discussion, although Kramer and Sprenger are more concerned with the question of whether witches can transform men into beasts and, if so, how they do so. As with most contemporary texts discussing metamorphosis, the authors refer to Saint Augustine and Ovid. Kramer and Sprenger also add references to Saints Thomas and Antoninus and diverse "modern Doctors."[27] Like Boguet, they remind the reader that Satan's demonic servants were once angelic and "although they have lost grace, [they] have not lost their natural power."[28] Therefore, the authors say, men must make the assumption that demons and devils can deceive the senses, just as an angel can, should they so desire. Kramer and Sprenger deny metamorphosis as a real change, rather focusing on the Augustinian doctrine of illusory change. Because of the weight of authority placed on Saints Augustine, Thomas, and Antoninus, Kramer and Sprenger state: "Whoever believes that it is possible for any creature to be changed for the better or for the worse, or to be transformed into any other shape or likeness, except by the Creator Himself, Who made all things, and by Whom all things are created, is without doubt an infidel, and worse than a pagan."[29]

Nicole Jacques-Lefevre aruges that these show a "definite agreement [. . .] that the werewolf is a diabolical figure and is associated with witchcraft"[30] as well as cannibalism, although the debate over the reality and mechanics of such transformations

was still debated. Jean Bodin's *La Démonomanie des Sorciers* (1580),[31] for instance, held that metamorphosis was indeed real and that the spirit or reason remained with the transformed individual. Several of his colleagues (such as Reginald Scot) determined that Bodin himself was a sorcerer for even considering that argument.[32] The majority of experts on the Continent (at least in France and Germany) appear to favor lycanthropy as a delusion or illusion created by the Devil. Davidson concludes that, despite commonly being seen as distinct phenomena, "witchcraft and lycanthropy came to be frequently associated in the minds of both the clergy and laity"[33] during this periods.

Despite the persistence of werewolf trials on the Continent, there are no known werewolf trials or accusations in England during the early modern period. Because wolf attacks were no longer a real threat to the English, werewolf attacks were also a non-threat. If there were no longer any wolves on the island, there was nowhere for the werewolves to hide. Moreover, if no one had seen a wolf in a few generations, claims of seeing one hold little weight. Therefore, the English demonological experts treated lycanthropy as an academic problem rather than as practical issue because, according to Hirsh, the "werewolf, like the wolf, was at best a theoretical threat for the English."[34] Davidson notes that in England as on the Continent, "almost all sixteenth-century witchcraft literature discussed lycanthropy."[35] Nearly all of this literature treated lycanthropy as a mental illness rather than as demonic in origin. The most likely reason for the popularity of this characterization is the extermination of the native wolf population sometime during the Middle Ages. An exact date for this extermination is impossible to determine as discussed in the previous chapter.

Based on the number of accounts imported from the Continent, the werewolf remained a popular subject of reading and discussion in England despite the minimal coverage present in demonological tracts.[36] This continued interest simultaneously presents questions as to why the figure retained its medieval popularity and strengthens support for the werewolf's status as a manifestation of a larger archetype in Jungian terms. In order to determine some reasons for the interest in werewolves in England during this period, we ought to look at the Renaissance English interest in monsters in general. Unlike the medieval era, Smith notes that "the Renaissance was less interested in far-off monstrous races [. . .] than in the monsters they could see about them"[37] such as deformed children and animals. There is a clear shift of focus in teratology from foreign monsters to native monsters.

Rather than writing about cynocephali and giants like their medieval ancestors, most early modern teratologists discussed French, German, Scandinavian, Spanish, and other European monsters, including werewolves. As David Gilmore states, "monsters are sources of identification and awe as well as horror,"[38] simultaneously repudiated and fascinating. In addition, for the concept of the werewolf, Gilmore adds that the "mixture of human and animal is a direct consequence of a profound ambivalence shared by all people: a simultaneous terror and fascination with the beast within, the impulsive need to both deny and acknowledge that, no matter how exalted, we humans are members of the animal kingdom and heir to violent instincts."[39] To see vivid examples of such instincts, early modern English audiences needed only look to news both at home and abroad as the Reformation swept through Europe. The werewolf takes this ambivalence and channels

it into a safe representation, especially for the English. Violent bestial tendencies (murder, rape, cannibalism) are easily explained in the werewolf as the animal side ascendant, which the audience can then deny in itself. The denial is, potentially at least, especially easy for the English. Because all of their werewolf accounts were imported from foreign sources, the English audience could comment on the bestial French or Germans, safe in the knowledge that no Englishman would ever turn into a wolf. Although there are accounts, in witch trials, of Englishmen and women turning into cats, horses, and other animals, none appears to become an animal known for violence. Moreover, the English knew wolves were a threat they could defeat, since they had already exterminated the native wolf population. Cats, on the other hand, were ubiquitous in both urban and rural areas, and were known for their nocturnal stealth rather than violence. Thus, cats became strongly associated with witchcraft, as they were on the Continent, but were more fearsome than wolves to the English.

Looking at the dissemination of information about appearances of the monstrous it is important, as Smith contends, "to view the popularity of monsters in the Renaissance in the context of the development of communications media in the period."[40] This development, notably in the form of broadsides and other ephemeral products made possible by the printing press, insured that Stubbe Peeter's trial record was able to make its way from Germany to England in less than a year. The same can be said for Simon Goulart's *Admirable and Memorable Histories* (1607), translated and printed in England in the same year as the French edition.[41] This printing technology and its attendant distribution networks can also be applied to the production and dissemination of the

myriad treatises on witchcraft, virtually all of which, Davidson states, "still contained discussions about the possibility of werewolves as such, or of werewolf/witches. There were works written specifically about lycanthropy. There were also a small number of pamphlets and broadsides devoted to the topic of werewolves"[42] circulating throughout the seventeenth century. These pamphlets included Martin del Rio's *Disquisitionum Magicarum* (1599), Henri Boguet's *Discours des Sorciers* (1602, reprinted eight times by 1610), Francisco Guazzo's *Compendium Maleficarum* (1608), Jean de Nyauld's *De la lycanthropie* (1615), and Francois Perreaud's *Demonologie* (1653).[43] Even Thomas Blount's *Glossographia: or a Dictionary* (1661), defines the werewolf:

> this name remains still known in the Teutonick, and is as much as *Man-wolf*; which is a certain *Sorcerer*, who having anointed his body with an Ointment made by instinct of the Devil, and putting on a certain inchanted Girdle, does not only to the view of others, seem as a *Wolf*, but to his own thinking, hath both the shape and nature of a *Wolf*, so long as he wears the said Girdle, and accordingly worries and kills humane creatures.[44]

Although an English author, Blount includes this very Continental definition along with the reference to Stubbe Peeter. That said, he implies that the term is no longer common in England, but only among "the Teutonick," and that the definition is likewise limited geographically. In many cases, these broadsides and pamphlets were used by English clergymen to make theological points regarding both the English and their Continental neighbors. Printing in these forms increased the scope of readers that religious writers could reach. As Helaine Razovsky states in her discussion of monstrous children,

"whether the broadsides use sensational news as an excuse for religious commentary or religious commentary as an excuse for sensational news is unimportant. The link itself is significant, because the link suggests that nothing is separable from religion."[45] Moreover, in England the link suggests that even though the English had no reported cases of werewolves, such stories were immensely popular. Otherwise, there would be no reason for religious leaders to attach their commentaries.

## Manichean Lycanthropy, or Early Psychoanalysis

Although a split over the issue of lycanthropy existed between the continent and England, there were some crossover authors. Among these was Simon Goulart's *Admirable and Memorable Histories*. Hedging his bets, Goulart stated that two different forms of werewolf existed by the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Initially, he states "there be Licanthropes in whom the melancholike humor doth so rule, as they imagine themselves to be transformed into Wolfes."[46] Although the text was written and first printed in France before being translated into English in the same year, this section presents a decidedly English view of werewolves. Since, as Hirsh states, "demonology picked up where theology left off"[47] in exploring the signs and logistics of lycanthropy, especially illusory change, this text includes the physical signs of lycanthropic madness:

"such as are afflicted with that disease, are pale, their eyes are hollow, and they see much ill, their tongue is drye, they are much altered, and are without spittle in the mouth."[48] This sort of clinical description is characteristic of the English texts that go into detail about the disease. However, Goulart is a transitional figure. He states that there are also "Licanthropes transformed really from Men into Wolves [. . .] men are some-times changed into Beasts, the humaine reason remaining: whether it bee done by the power of GOD immediately, or that this power is given to Sathan, the executioner of his will, or rather of his fearefull judgements."[49] This, then, is the classic Continental werewolf, the servant of Satan who has received his, or rarely her, power from the "executioner" or one of his minions. In spite of saying that this transformation really happens, Goulart, taking up the mantle of demonology, explains that "the soules taken out of the bodyes, enter into these fantosmes or visions, running with the shapes of Wolves: then when the worke enterprized by the Divell is finished, they returne into their bodyes which then recover life,"[50] a clear example of the psychic werewolf. Interestingly, this rendition works against the theologians' general teachings that the soul cannot leave the body and that, even if it could, it would be impossible for an animal body to contain a soul. It does, though, take into account the argument presented by earlier authorities that the body dies without the soul while presenting the theologically problematic issue that Satan takes God's power unto himself by maintaining the soul-less body.

G. Havers' translation of *A General Collection of Discourses of the Virtuosi of France, Upon Questions of all Sorts of Philosophy, and Other Natural Knowledge* (1664) is another transitional text, much like Goulart's. The first notable element of the

*Discourses* is that it links a discussion of lycanthropy to "Of the way to acquire Nobility" in Conference XXXIV.[51] This equation of lycanthropy and nobility not only speaks to the potentially monstrous nature of self-fashioning, but hearkens back to medieval associations through Bisclavret, Alphouns, Gorlagon, and the Ossory werewolves. It also anticipates Pratchett's Wolfgang and Angua in their place among the nobility.

As noted, like Goulart's text, Havers' translation straddles the conceptual divide between the Continent and the Anglo-Scots. Initially, the text presents a classic Continental view of werewolves stating that "people of *Livonia*, which as *Olaus* in his Northern History relates, change themselves into Wolves, and on Christ-mass day exercise many cruelties even upon little children."[52] This is the site of the text's first transition point; between the medieval noble-werewolf alluded to above and the early modern child-threatening monster. This view is then linked to earlier Continental positions with the assertion that:

> Seeing a Rational Soul can not naturally animate the Body of a Wolf. The least distemper of our Brain suffices to hinder the Soul from exercising its functions, and can it exercise them in that of a Beast? 'Tis more credible that some evil Spirit supplies the place, and acts the part of the Sorcerer who is soundly asleep in his Bed, or in some other place apart from the commerce of Men.[53]

This statement includes a recapitulation of the beliefs that the soul cannot inhabit an animal body and that a devil tricks the werewolf into believing a transformation occurred. The "Virtuosi" agree with ecclesiastics that the devil creates illusions, not substance, and that only the Devil could effect these tricks.

However, the text also presents some scientific reasoning. For instance, the "Virtuosi" state that transformations must be illusion "[f]or otherwise, how should the Sorcerer reduce his Body into so small a volumn as the form of a Rat, Mouse, Toad, and other such Animal into which it sometimes is turn'd."[54] This is a clear argument by what would later be called the Law of Conservation of Mass and is, interestingly, an argument that the Anglo-Scottish sources do not otherwise appear to consider. The "Virtuosi" do add that "[a]s for the causes of this brutish malady, whereby a Man imagines himself a Wolf, or is so indeed, they are of three sorts; the biting of a mad Wolf, the atrabilarious humour, of the Imagination perverted."[55] In other words: rabies, an imbalance of the humors, or an overactive (or demonically inspired) imagination. The atrabilarious humour is associated with melancholy in this discourse, much as the Anglo-Scottish sources claim. However, the "Virtuosi" are not quite ready to give up the supernatural element. They state that the imagination alone is not strong enough to cause the believed transformation "[not] but that a fourth cause, (namely evil spirits) interposes sometimes with those natural causes, and particularly with that gloomy black Humour," melancholy.[56] This view of devilishly enhanced melancholy not only retains previous beliefs, it also serves as an explanation of why cases of melancholy do not invariably lead to lycanthropy. Thus, the "Virtuosi" conclude that classical accounts of shape-shifting are metaphors while modern accounts are illusions or madnesses enhanced by devilish involvement. Unlike Goulart, the anonymous "Virtuosi" remain orthodox in that they claim that even if transformation occurs, it is merely an illusion perpetrated by a demon that causes the lycanthrope to believe he actually changed form and committed atrocities.

However, this position introduces questions of agency and accountability in that the demon commits the crime. Presumably, the "sorcerer" (often referred to as "it") is assumed to conjure the demon for aid and is therefore complicit in the crimes.

These particular accounts straddle the border between English and continental views regarding the werewolf. In fact, they are two of a mere handful, if that many, extant texts that cross that boundary whether being English treatises avowing the reality of transformation or continental texts broaching madness as a viable alternative. The early modern English and Scots, despite these occasional boundary-crossing accounts, support a tradition that mixes metaphorical readings of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* with proto-psychological discussions of lycanthropy. A scholarly tradition of lycanthropy as simple mental illness caused by melancholy develops from these two major sources.

## Metaphoric Madness, or Wolves in Men's Clothing

Despite the re-discovery of many classical texts, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* remained one of the most influential texts in Western literature during the early modern period. According to Michel Jeanneret, the *Metamorphoses* was one of the "most frequently published, commented upon, translated, and imitated"[57] secular texts of the early modern era. This influence can be clearly seen in the work of various demonologists, scholars,

humanists, and playwrights throughout the period as Ovid's work is commonly cited by the former and adapted by the latter.

Ovid's influence only hints at the popularity of werewolf tales in England during the early modern period because it says nothing as to a broader collection of beliefs and views regarding the werewolf or lycanthrope. Jeanneret notes that part of the "appeal of metamorphosis is definitely associated with an attraction for beginnings—birth and rebirth—and a determination to perpetuate the dynamics of the miraculous creative gesture."[58] Ovid encouraged an interest in transformation that was already present in the human psyche. Despite a lack of tales regarding native English werewolves, then, the interest in change, beginnings, and creation continued to move throughout the period. And the moralists were not shy about adopting and adapting this popular text for their own purposes. For example, according to R. W. Maslen, Rainolde's "retelling of Ovid's myth of Lycaon, moralized as an illustration of the ease with which men may take on the properties of wolves."[59] Rainolde's wolves were both the proverbial ones stalking around the edges of Christ's flock and the metaphoric ones seeking to oust legitimate rulers and usurp the true faith.

Another way modern audiences can understand the early modern fascination with Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in particular, metamorphosis in general, and werewolves, is by recalling that Ovid, in Jeanneret's words, "dwells on the transitory phase where a creature suspended between two identities, combining two species, temporarily resembles a monster."[60] Even so, Wiseman contends, "God was understood to have created animal-human distinctions and hierarchy"[61] which were inviolate, at least from the perspective of

mere mortals. For the English, who were not threatened by wolf attacks, the transformations had to be read metaphorically, or by "othering" the denizens of the rest of Europe. One of the more prevalent metaphors involved religious connections. As Hirsh states, in theological debates "the werewolf and the Catholic were similar beasts: both were essentially 'wolves dressed as men,' otherwise indistinguishable from the rest of society but still a threat to church and state"[62] especially during Elizabeth I's reign. Priests slipping across the Channel into England after Henry VIII broke away from the Church can easily be likened to the wolf harrying the fringes of the flock. In this case, the wolf stands for both Catholics and Satan while the flock is both "true" Christians and the English people, protected by the shepherd (Christ and Elizabeth). As noted below, these connections seem to be made more often by poets and pamphleteers than by official religious leaders in that the clergy appears to leave the matter in secular hands.

By the beginning of the early modern period, Hirsh states that, "English demonological opinion on the werewolf and transformations in general tended toward ascribing lycanthropy to madness and melancholy, although a minority continued to profess its traditional, supernatural origin."[63] Obviously this transition from seeing lycanthropy as demonic in nature to seeing it as a mental illness did not occur overnight. As previously discussed, some authors straddled the boundary, notably Goulart. Most, though, including Robert Burton, Robert Bayfield, Reginald Scot, and James I strongly supported the lycanthropy-as-madness view. That said, Hirsh also notes that an "examination of the demonological tracts published in England during this period uncovers a trend from a representation of lycanthropy as a manifestation of the demonic

exacerbation of illness, madness, or melancholy, to one set out in wholly medical terms."[64] This trend is seen through a representative sample of demonologists of the late sixteenth to mid-seventeenth centuries, where we see a shift from denying the theological, supernatural lycanthrope while positing the psychological, to completely ignoring any supernatural aspects.

Reginald Scot's *The Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584) is a handbook for would-be witch hunters. In book five, Scot refers to shape-shifting as "verie absurdities," refuting "this impossible, incredible, and supernaturall, or rather unnaturall doctrine of transubstantiation" or metamorphosis.[65] To support his rejection of real shape-changing, Scot refers to biblical doctrine and Saint Augustine's *City of God* as proof that only God can change a thing's form. Onsequently, witches cannot change into animals. Scot focuses his attacks solely on Jean Bodin, who argued for the validity of metamorphosis and the reality of shape-shifting in Homer and Ovid based on the *Malleus Maleficarum*. Scot rejects such claims, declaring that "[i]t is a certaine and a generall rule, that two substantiall formes cannot be in one subject."[66] This statement is a response to the belief that werewolves wore their wolf pelts inside their body while in human form and vice versa.

Regarding psychic werewolves, Scot cites the fictitious Hermes Trismegistus and Saints Paul and James to refute the possibility of the soul departing the body, whether through witchcraft or satanic agency, and its ability to reside however briefly in the body of an animal. Trismegistus, according to Scot, wrote that just as a human soul cannot rest in any but a human body, it also cannot "light into a body that wanteth reason of mind,"[67]

e.g. an animal's. Likewise, both Saints Paul and James argued that a body without a soul is dead. Thus, unless witches and/or demons could perform miracles akin to those of God (maintaining a corpse and bringing it back to life), such a form of lycanthropy could not exist either.

Scot ultimately concludes that lycanthropy is "a disease proceeding partly from melancholy, whereby many suppose themselves to be wolves, or such ravening beasts. For Lycanthropia is of the ancient Physicians called *Lupina melancholia*, or *Lupina insania*."[68] Here Scot invokes uncited and unnamed early authorities (we cannot determine whether he actually discovered and then re-lost them or is simply creating ancient sources to establish a longer tradition). Whichever he is using, the important part is that Scot argues for the reality of werewolves as people suffering from mental disorders, not actual shape-shifters.

Although James I's famous *Daemonologie* (1597) contains a section entitled "Men-Woolfes," he spends very little time on werewolves. In fact, the section might justifiably be dubbed an afterthought. His succinct conclusion is that "if anie such thing hath bene, I take it to have proceeded but of a naturall super-abundance of Melancholie, which as wee reade, that it hath made some thinke themselves Pitchers, and some horses, and some one kinde of beast or other."[69] Since James determines that werewolves are merely the mentally ill and not demonic, he spends no more time on them.

Deacon and Walker's *Dialogicall Discourses of Spirits and Divels* (1601) includes a longer and more involved discussion. Like James I, Deacon and Walker set up their text in the form of a dialogue. Their discussion of werewolves, though, takes the

shape of a group of speakers—Orthodoxus, Philologus, and Physiologus—attempting to cure Lycanthropus.[70] Physiologus is the first to deal with the patient's problem, stating "You are called *Lycanthropus*: that is, a man transformed into a woolfe: which name is verie fitlie derived from the verie disease it selfe that disorders your braine, called *Lycanthropia*."[71] The others attempt to persuade Lycanthropus that Physiologus' diagnosis is correct. They discuss lycanthropy as a mixture of melancholy and choler, which Orthodoxus ties to "Diana the pagane Goddesse"[72]—a connection that is not uncommon in early modern lycanthropic discussions and possibly tied to moon-based changing. Representing orthodox religion (and echoing Kramer and Sprenger), Orthodoxus finally states:

> Whosoever beleeveth that any one creature can be made or changed into better or woorse, or to be transformed into any other shape, or into any other similitude, by any other then by God himselfe the creator of all things: without doubt, he is but an Infidell, and woorse then a Pagane.[73]

And Philologus ends the attempt to convince their patient with an appeal to the community, "your opinion (it appeareth) is plainely condemned of all: and therefore, forsake it for shame."[74] Lycanthropus sees the error of his ways and is cured through reason.

The final appeal in Deacon and Walker's account is tied to the social fears that werewolves and madness raised. On the personal level, Jacques-Lefevre states, "intransformable violence [. . .] is linked to the figure of the werewolf,"[75] including cannibalism and self-afflicted injuries. While these are dangerous to the general

populace of the community, a greater threat is that the werewolf was typically tied to monstrous events such as civil war. Likewise, for the community, according to Hirsh, the werewolf is "not only dangerous because it is capable of committing such depraved acts, but because it is a *hidden* threat."[76] This threat is equally important and worrisome whether the werewolf is an actual shape-changer, is suffering from a mental disorder, or is a metaphor for a Catholic. The latter two cases could be even more threatening, in fact, since there may be no outward signs. The potential for ties to religious belief during the Reformation era is clear as Hirsh adds, the werewolf and Catholic were "ever-present cannibalistic enemies [hidden] within the society"[77] they threaten.

Unlike its predecessors, Burton's *Diseases of the Mind* (1621) is medical in its discussion of werewolves. As he states, "*Lycanthropia*, [. . .], when men run howling about graves and fields in the night, and will not be perswaded but that they are Wolves."[78] The only real dispute Burton offers is that "Ætius and Paulus call it a kind of Melancholy; but I should rather refer it to Madness, as most do."[79] The author assumes throughout the text that all his readers agree that lycanthropy is a disease; he never argues against the supernatural theory of werewolfism. Instead, the closest he comes to such a statement is to declare: "This disease perhaps gave occasion to that bold assertion of Pliny, some men were turned into Wolves in his time, and from Wolves to men again."[80] This brief acknowledgement includes equally brief references to Pausanias, Ovid, and Saint Augustine. The rest of his discussion of lycanthropia is a simple list of symptoms: victims "go abroad in the night, barking, howling, at graves and deserts; they have

usually hollow eyes, scabbed legs and thighs, very dry and pale"[81] and are supposedly most often struck in February.

Bayfield's *Της Ιατρικης Καρτοσ or A Treatise De Morborum Capitis Essentiis & Prognosticis* (1663), adds little to the studies already discussed. Indeed, his entire discussion of werewolves takes up less than half a page of modern print and nearly all of his werewolf section is copied word for word from Burton. The key statement in the text is that "Wolf-madness, is a disease, in which men run barking and howling about graves and fields in the night, lying hid for the most part all day, and will not be perswaded but that they are Wolves, or some such beasts."[82] Bayfield's treatise has been linked with Burton's here because the two are virtually identical in their basic information. The connection with graves and cemeteries is a common one as Lynn Enterline argues: "lycanthropes [. . .] refuse death as they refuse tears [being dry] by violating the place of ritual boundary, the grave or graveyard, with which society marks the difference between the living and the dead."[83] Blount (1661) uses similar language when he defines lycanthropy as "a frenzy or melancholy, which causeth the patient (who thinks he is turned into a Wolf) to fly all company, and hide himself in dens and corners."

John Brinley's *A Discovery of the Impostures of Witches and Astrologers* (1680) is very similar to Burton and Bayfield. In fact, his early language on lycanthropy appears to be a paraphrase of Bayfield: "as some Physicians tell us, men run howling about Graves and Fields in the night, and will not be perswaded but that they are Wolves, or such like beasts."[84] Brinley does add to the list of symptoms, noting: convulsions, madnesses, outcries, shriekings, frothing, and gnashing of the teeth. Unlike his

predecessors, Brinley uses the illness as a vehicle for railing against untrained and uncharitable physicians. He claims the aforementioned symptoms come from natural causes "yet the vulgar is ready to believe there is something more in the Case. And that which doth more confirm them in this Creed, is either the want of able Physicians, or their inability to employ them; for they are seldom so Charitable as to make and more Recipe's, than they receive Guinies."[85] Thus "sorry Emperiks" and charlatans feed the public belief and their own pockets. As previously discussed, this brings the werewolf back into the arena of shaping and commenting on society through representing social ills.

These medical/psychological treatises on lycanthropy are the key texts that informed, and built from, the first English dramatic representation of the werewolf.[86] We can see why the werewolf, or wolfish man, was as useful or interesting for early modern playwrights as it was for medieval writers. Referring back to teratology, Jeanneret notes that "the monster invites us to extend the frontiers of the known, to celebrate a universe in perpetual gestation that encompasses all possible forms of life, far beyond the narrow limits of our knowledge."[87] The monster, and especially the shape-changing one, compels the imagination to dwell upon change. Moreover, Fudge adds that "although the theological context and that of disease and melancholy are crucial to the understanding of the werewolf, they overlap with other ways of understanding this border creature, ways that are strongly tied to ideas and experiences of the social and the civic."[88]

Theater, arguably, shares the same ties as an attempt to capture, preserve, mold, or critique social and civic ideas or experiences. Thus, it is hardly surprising that one of the

period's most well known playwrights, John Webster, should choose to incorporate, to some extent, the lycanthropic figure. Rather than presenting the supernatural werewolf for entertainment purposes as their forebears—the medieval *lais* and romances—did, John Webster turned to debates circulating through the realm of demonology and academic discourse as inspiration for his wolfish characters. Webster, through his popularity and market penetration, makes the first extant representation of a mass entertainment werewolf in England. Although, as noted in the previous chapter, there are indications of earlier oral tales, none are clearly documented outside the courtly audience until Webster's *Duchess*.

In *The Duchess of Malfi* (1614), the werewolf stands in as a metaphor for, as Jacques-Lefevre notes, "social ills, the loss of values, the individual and collective depravation and degeneration."[89] This is not the only role the werewolf plays. The lycanthrope also functions as a discussion of the civil as, in Jennifer Richards' words, "synonymous with orderly and accommodating manners,"[90] as well as, according to Jacques-Lefevre, placing the relationship between the divine and bestial natures of man in "terms of individual or social morality."[91] The figure was also viewed with a certain ambivalence since wolves were seen as being anti-social, dangerous to live with, and generally violent, yet at the same time humans who were able to draw upon the wolf's characteristics were said to be strengthened, usually in threatening ways. In addition, Jonathan Bate argues that " [t]he moral interpretation, in which Lycaon represents all oppressive and cruel men [. . .] gained new strength from the humanist emphasis on the

moral wisdom of pagan culture,"[92] thereby increasing the range of character interpretations.

*The Duchess of Malfi* follows a fairly straightforward plot: the title character is widowed, her brothers—one a cardinal, the other a duke—attempt to use her widowhood to their own advantage, she secretly marries against their will, and all three siblings ultimately die. There are a number of elements that show a keen understanding of contemporary debates regarding lycanthropy and Webster's direct adoption of the figure has generated a fair amount of critical discussion in the last two decades. The play's use of melancholy and medical lycanthropy is alluded to in the very first scene where Ferdinand tells Bosola, "Be yourself: / Keep your old garb of melancholy" (I.i.268-9)[93] in order to deceive and spy upon the Duchess. Ferdinand's obsession with appearances and reputation compounds the allusions to medical lycanthropy as the only way he can cast off his obsession is to go mad. Since the duke's subconscious incestuous desire for his twin sister is revealed as the plot develops, his descent into *lycanthropia* is tied to what Briggs calls the "symbolic association between the wolf and predatory sexuality [which] runs though much of European folklore."[94] Ferdinand further strengthens the ties between the play and medical lycanthropy in his cry for rhubarb "To purge this choler!" (II.v.13), a mental imbalance associated with lycanthropia by Deacon and Walker. Later in that scene, Ferdinand's rant about his sister's children (lines 68-75) echoes Lycaon's attempt to expose Jove as a non-god as recounted by Ovid. That is, the duke claims his desire is to burn/cook the children and feed them to their father.

Ferdinand's conversations with his sister are full of allusions to lycanthropy. He says of her "Methinks her fault and beauty, / Blended together, show like leprosy," a disease associated with werewolves in the Middle Ages (III.iii.61-2). Soon after, Ferdinand directly asks his sister, "Where are your cubs?" (IV.i.33). These statements and his characterization of the murder of the Duchess' children—"The death / Of young wolves is never to be pitied" (IV.ii.250-1)—display moments of what may be termed transference, shifting the lycanthropia that is assailing his mind onto his sister. Such transference might make sense to the deranged Ferdinand: logically if one twin were a werewolf, the other might be too. Alternatively, these statements can be read as Ferdinand's attempts to characterize his sister as Other, therefore justifying his orders to murder both her and her children. Through these characterizations the werewolf in this play has, as Katherine Edwards notes, "allowed an oppositional perspective on behavior to be expressed"[95] in both the character's and the playwright's cultures—Italian and English respectively. That is to say, werewolfing his sister, even by implication, justifies Ferdinand's behavior toward her, even if only in his own mind. That this justification is only in his mind is clearly the case, judging by the reactions of the other characters in the final scene of the play. Ferdinand's actions suit his madness; his *lycanthropia* is reinforced or enhanced, pushing him further from normalcy the more he works against his sister, who is also himself. Through these means, Jacques-Lefevre's assertion that "the figure of the lycanthrope is thus at heart a reflection on the definition of nature, being, and man,"[96] is borne out.

Webster depicts Ferdinand's complete descent into madness in great detail. This is heralded by his concern that his misdeeds, namely the murder of his twin sister, will be discovered. To that end, he cries that "The wolf shall find her grave, and scrape it up; / Not to devour the corpse, but to discover / The horrid murder" (IV.ii.301-3). Clearly, this concern is tied to the folkloric connection between werewolves (victims of lycanthropia) and graveyards. The murder, and surrounding references to wolves, also calls for parallels with the legend/myth of Romulus and Remus, another set of Italian twins associated with wolves and murder for political or social gain. This particular legend provides a foundation for connecting Ferdinand's lycanthropia and werewolves to tyranny; the civil crisis that is present in both the legend of Rome's foundation and Lycaon is present as well in Ferdinand's tale, as it involves three siblings who are simultaneously major political figures. Therefore, as Wiseman states, "the play uses Ferdinand as lycanthrope to suggest both the ambiguous power of wolfishness and its crucial association with rule—with tyranny, and specifically with the threat to social relations"[97] since the duke's madness has far-reaching socio-political ramifications.

Every allusion to lycanthropia present in the play serves to set the stage for the fifth act, in which Ferdinand is completely consumed by lycanthropia but then recovers. All of the information the audience acquires about the duke's madness comes from his doctor who states that Ferdinand suffers from "A very pestilent disease, my lord, / They call lycanthropia" (V.ii.5-6). Pressed by the duke's servant, the doctor expands on this prognosis:

In those that are possessed with't there o'erflows

Such melancholy humour, they imagine
Themselves to be transformèd into wolves,
Steal forth to churchyards in the dead of night,
And dig dead bodies up; as two nights since
One met the Duke, 'bout midnight in a lane
Behind Saint Mark's church, with the leg of a man
Upon his shoulder; and he howled fearfully;
Said he was a wolf, only the difference
Was a wolf's skin was hairy on the outside,
His on the inside (V.ii.8-18)

This diagnosis reveals that Ferdinand's illness is wholly natural, if brought upon by socially unacceptable impulses and actions. As if to underscore the doctor's words, the duke refers to himself as "a sheep-biter" (V.ii.50) and attacks his own shadow. The latter action particularly lends itself to a Jungian interpretation as the representation of everything Ferdinand has done or thought that is unacceptable to society, namely his incestuous desire and the murders he ordered. In this case, Hirsh states that lycanthropia "poses important questions of moral responsibility [. . .] Even if Ferdinand's affliction is the result of demonic possession or divine punishment, this is accompanied by a moral ambiguity in respect of his subsequent actions."[98] Since the play leaves no implication of either of the latter sources for the affliction, the moral ambiguity becomes even more pronounced as the play broaches the question of whether the mentally disturbed can be held liable for their actions. Since Ferdinand is set upon and killed at the end, Webster's

answer to the question seems clear, at least in the case of madnesses that threaten the social fabric. However, by the time he is accused and slain, Ferdinand has been more or less cured of his illness, buttressing Fudge's claim that "the transformation of the werewolf, is temporary. Human status, although losable, can be reclaimed."[99] For Ferdinand, the cost of this reclamation is ultimate restitution for his crimes.

Seeking sources for Ferdinand's madness, Courtney Lehmann and Bryan Reynolds suggest that "[a]lthough the exact source of werewolf syndrome in early modern culture is disputed, the cause is almost invariably attributed to an encounter with a suspected witch," in this case, the Duchess' "bewitching sexuality."[100] Such an assertion is supported neither by the Continental tradition (where the vast majority of werewolves were tried as witches themselves) nor by the English tradition, in which lycanthropy (or werewolf syndrome) was always attributed to madness and melancholy. Since Webster clearly drew from the native English tradition, as evidenced by the passages discussed previously, the introduction of witchcraft, absent from the play, lacks a solid foundation.

A stronger interpretation can be found in Ferdinand's susceptibility to *lycanthropia* and *melancholia* compared to that of the play's audience and society. According to Enterline's theory, "[i]n Ferdinand's metamorphosis, Webster ties the pervasive metaphor of the *corpus politicus* to contemporary medical discourse and folklore about one of melancholia's extreme . . . forms."[101] She points to the admonition about contagion at the beginning of the play (I.1.4-15) as evidence that the body politic, not to mention the social body, can become infected—whether with melancholy,

lycanthropia, madness, or something else is unclear. The body politic makes an intriguing analogue for the importance of bodies (especially the Duchess') throughout the play. As Enterline asserts, "[t]he lycanthrope's scraping in the ground for limbs merely recapitulates a rhetoric of body parts that has done nothing but grow increasingly literal over the course of the play."[102]

Webster's play looks back to Stubbe Peeter's trial in its connection between lycanthropy and incest, especially violent incest. This also serves to link lycanthropy to the popular audience through the themes of incest and cannibalism. Both themes were well represented on the early modern stage, most notably in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* (1594)[103] and John Ford's *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* (1629-33).[104] The clearest example in *Titus* appears in act five, scene three in which Titus serves a pie to Tamora and her husband. The contents of the pie being Chiron and Demetrius (her sons) recalls Ovid's Lycaon and thus the link between lycanthropy and cannibalism. This connection is further evoked in relation to Stubbe Peeter because the brothers had "Ravisht [Lavinia] and cut away her tongue."[105] The combination of ravishment, cannibalism, and symbolic incest—Tamora's ingestion of her sons—serves to form a link that comes to fruition when Ford incorporates Webster into the story. Ford's *'Tis Pity* combines Shakespeare's cannibalism and Webster's overt incestuous desire. Unlike Webster's Ferdinand, Ford's Giovanni acts upon his desire, with his willing sister Annabella, and produces a child (who remains unborn). However, Giovanni shares certain traits with Ferdinand in that he descends into insanity and illness due to his desire. In a twisted parody of the medieval romance tradition, Giovanni laments that he is "so sick / 'Twill cost my life" (I.ii.185-86)

because of his love for his sister. This is also prophetic in that, like Ferdinand, after he kills his sister to keep her from her husband (V.v), Giovanni is slain by a veritable mob of courtiers. Giovanni adds a symbolically cannibalistic gesture by cutting out Annabella's heart (to further keep her to himself) and brandishing it before Soranzo. That three notable playwrights maintain these themes and one explicitly connects them to lycanthropy serves two purposes: it presents a chain of continuity from classical (for cannibalism) and previous early modern (for incest) traditions linked to the werewolf, and it forms a place for the monstrous lycanthrope to be concealed in adult literature that parallels the werewolf's appearance in the fairy tale genre.

The employment of werewolves as metaphors to remedy social ills hearkens back to the late Roman and early medieval animal fables, represented by Aesop and Marie de France. Their literary position also serves to usher in an era of the werewolf as man-like wolf. For an excellent representation of that conception of the figure, we turn to Charles Perrault.

## Wolf-Men for Children

The wolf Charles Perrault depicts in his story "Little Red Riding Hood" (1697) fulfills most of the medieval criteria for humanity: he talks, he wears clothes (or at least

steals clothes to wear), and he possesses reason. He retains two bestial characteristics: diet (humans) and weaponry (teeth and claws). He shares other characteristics with medieval werewolves as well, notably with Bisclavret. Like Marie's werewolf, Perrault's wolf is always referred to through a generic word—wolf—which is sometimes turned into a proper noun/name and other times not. Another similarity with Bisclavret is that Perrault's wolf-man appears, as Leslie Dunton-Downer states, as "a figure for violence in the male human."[106] This interpretation is underscored by the moral that Perrault placed at the end of the tale:

> I say Wolf, for all wolves
> Are not of the same sort;
> There is one kind with an amenable disposition
> Neither noisy, nor hateful, nor angry,
> But tame, obliging and gentle,
> Following the young maids
> In the streets, even into their homes.
> Alas! Who does not know that these gentle wolves
> Are of all such creatures the most dangerous![107]

Perrault constructs this moral for a clear purpose: to warn young girls, especially nice, pretty ones, against predatory male strangers.[108] More generally the tale is an admonition against errors of judgment. This particular moral is well in keeping with the period, as Ruth Bottigheimer asserts, "fairy tales are understood to be imaginative constructs that are historically based, culture-specific, oral or written."[109] Although the tale originates in

a period before Perrault's, his version is influenced by a particular historical-cultural moment. Seeing a social problem, Perrault takes the wolf-man and employs the figure as a means of potentially rectifying the situation. What is unusual, considering Bottigheimer's statement, is that she also notes Perrault never associates his wolf-man with witchcraft. Indeed, his fairy tales are utterly lacking in witches, which is odd considering witch-hunts continued in Europe through at least the late eighteenth-century.[110]

Instead of associating his wolf with witches or even madness, Perrault distances his tales from previous traditions by making them metaphorical. In this way, and using this particular genre, he demonstrates that fables and fairy tales, in Maslen's words, "were of particular value as a covert means of saying what could not be said openly."[111] Although Perrault openly declares his lesson, he chooses a "covert" genre: one aimed at children and young adults. As we will see in the following chapters, this same covertness appears in the modern fantasy (F) genre, as well as science fiction (SF), particularly in F/SF aimed at children and young adults. Because of the genre, and the fact that it is generally seen as frivolous, authors can use the fairy tale—and F/SF, and fiction in general—to subtly discuss issues that would cause problems were they brought up in other media/genres.[112] Through his use of this genre and the wolf-man, Perrault re-invents the werewolf, "[a]s both human and animal—the one ideally communal and sociable, the other solitary and fierce—the werewolf embodies the tensions within humanity itself,"[113] to use Edwards' characterization. Readers see the wolf acting sociably in that he is reasonably well spoken, at least enough that "[t]he poor child, not

knowing that it was dangerous to stop and listen to a wolf"[114] did so and agreed to his sedate race to the grandmother's house. On the other hand, as he "sprang upon the poor old lady and ate her up in less than no time, for he had been three days without food,"[115] the wolf is clearly fierce and, since he eats the other characters and avoids civilization, is solitary.

Perrault's tale invites a multitude of interpretations. Jane Yolen summarizes the variety of literary interpretations:

> Anthropologists have read it as a folk memory of old menstruation myths or sun/moon myths. Freudians point to it as a possible incest story, or a pregnancy fantasy. Marxists have seen it as the triumph of the proletariat over the evil capitalists who would lure them into a cozy relationship and then devour them. And moralists through the ages say it means simply: Young women should not go to bed with strangers who may turn out to be "wolves."[116]

Jack Zipes adds to the multiplicity of interpretations. He argues that Perrault made significant changes to the original late-medieval story:

> First, she is donned with a *red* hat, a *chaperon*, making her into a type of bourgeouis girl tainted with sin, since red, like the scarlet letter A, recalls the devil and heresy. Second, she is spoiled, negligent, and naïve. Third, she speaks to a wolf in the woods—rather dumb on her part—and makes a type of contract with him: she accepts a wager which, it is implied, she wants to lose. Fourth, she plays right into the wolf's hands and is too stupid to trick him. Fifth, she is swallowed or raped like her grandmother. Sixth, there is no salvation, simply an

> ironic moral in verse which warns little girls to beware of strangers, otherwise they will deservedly suffer the consequences. Sex is obviously sinful. Playful intercourse outside of marriage is likened to rape, which is primarily the result of the little girl's irresponsible acts.[117]

All of these changes to the story reflect, in Zipes' argument, Perrault's own fear of women and sexual urges. The use of a child as the object of desire is notable for two reasons: children are the most impressionable members of society and children are the physically weakest members of society. The former is important because fairy tales target children and tales about children have a greater effect on that audience. The fact that children are also the physically weakest members of society is necessary for Perrault's version of the tale. Since Perrault's Riding Hood is, as Zipes contends, "stupid" and physically weaker than the wolf, she has nothing with which to resist his attack. Zipes also suggests that not only does she not resist, but she invites his advances. The wolf's choice of a young child as the object of predation also reflects the natural world in which predators often choose the youngest and eldest members of the herd because they are the weakest, much as Perrault's wolf attacks the child and her grandmother. Zipes also notes that, in this interpretation, Riding Hood plays an active role in her own punishment in that "[s]he seeks to know herself in a social context, gazes into the wolf's eyes to see a mirror reflection of who she might be, a confirmation of her own feelings."[118] This confirmation is linked to witches and werewolves as well, in that witches, Jews, and evil fairies wore red hats in stories from the medieval period through

the nineteenth-century and the woods are "a meeting place of witches and the haunting place of werewolves," thus adding more anti-social layers to the encounter.[119]

In a legal interpretation and response to Zipes, Sharon Johnson notes, "the wolf [. . .] is the only character that is represented as an animal; his ravenous appetite and violent ways are not repudiated."[120] That the wolf is not punished is difficult for modern audiences to reconcile, especially in a story that we typically regard as targeting a young audience. Most modern adult readers want to see the supposedly cannibalistic wolf punished for the double homicide.[121] But, as Johnson continues, "Although the wolf has just murdered two people, his actions are not condemned."[122]

To an earlier audience, though, there is no reason to punish or condemn the wolf. After all, the wolf's actions are perfectly natural for a wolf and, since he is a wolf, neither murder can be properly termed cannibalistic. The wolf may speak, wear clothes, and possess reason, but he is also animalistic and, as Red Riding Hood's questions at the end of the tale show, is emphatically a real wolf, rather than the term being used figuratively. Perrault's focus in the tale is, based on his moral and the story, completely on Red Riding Hood's transgressions of the rules and mores of society. Because she, perhaps unwittingly, broke the rules, she and her grandmother are punished. Bronislava Kerbelytê suggests that Riding Hood is punished "because she does not guess the functions of the parts of the tester's body."[123] Conversely, the wolf is rewarded with two meals because he reinforces and enforces the social moral code. Therefore, within the context of the fairy tale, the culture that produced it, and the long history of literary monsters/werewolves, there is no reason to censure or punish Perrault's wolf; he is

simply doing the job that his kind and every other cultural monster have performed for centuries.

## Into the Present

Two views of werewolves competed in the early modern period, though not the same two that existed in the Middle Ages. The medieval tension between the theological and popular conceptions gave way to a debate between satanic forces and madness as the ultimate cause of werewolfism. And, as with all such issues, gray areas between the two clearly existed, such as Goulart's theories and those writers who accepted lycanthropy as madness, but felt that demons caused or exacerbated the illness. The wolfish man (or mannish wolf) as literary metaphor won out for a time, at least in entertainment literature, while the lycanthropy-as-madness position took precedence in more scholarly realms. However, as the werewolf that physically changes forms re-entered entertainment literature in the late nineteenth to twenty-first centuries,[124] early modern concerns and questions returned alongside medieval conceptions to form the basis of the latest incarnations of the werewolf and larger shape-shifter archetype.[125] As previously alluded to, one of the key areas where this re-imagining and recycling occurs is in the realm of

children's and young adult fantasy fiction, especially those authors also popular with an adult audience.

[1] David Gilmore, *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2003) 12.
[2] Brett Hirsh, "An Italian Werewolf in London: Lycanthropy and *The Duchess of Malfi*," *Early Modern Literary Studies* 11.2 (September 2005): 2.
[3] John B. Lamb, "Mary Shelly's *Frankenstein* and Milton's Monstrous Myth," *Nineteenth Century Literature* 47.3 (December 1992): 318.
[4] Robin Briggs, "Dangerous Spirits: Shapeshifting, Apparitions, and Fantasy in Lorraine Witchcraft Trials," *Werewolves, Witches, and Wandering Spirits: Traditional Belief & Folklore in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Kathryn A. Edwards (Kirksville, MS: Truman State UP, 2002) 4.
[5] Maia Madar, "Estonia I: Werewolves and Poisoners," *Early Modern European Witchcraft: Centres and Peripheries*, eds. Bengt Ankarloo & Gustav Henningsen (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990) 270.
[6] Jane P. Davidson, "Wolves, Witches, and Werewolves: Lycanthropy and Witchcraft from 1423-1700," *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 2.4/8 (1990): 57.
[7] Ibid. 47.
[8] Norman R. Smith, "Portentous Births and the Monstrous Imagination in Renaissance Culture," *Marvels, Monsters, and Miracles: Studies in the Medieval and Early Modern Imagination*, eds. Timothy S. Jones and David A. Sprunger (Medieval Institute Publications, 2002) 268.
[9] Erica Fudge, *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture* (New York: St. Martin's, 2000) 34-5.
[10] Ibid. 35.
[11] *A True Discourse. Declaring the Damnable Life and Death of One Stubbe Peeter, a Most Wicked Sorcerer, Who in the Likenes of a Woolfe, Committed many Murders, Continuing This Develish Practice 25 Yeeres, Killing and Devouring Men, Women, and Children* (London, 1590) 4.
[12] Ibid. 7-10
[13] Ibid. 7.
[14] Ibid. 10.
[15] Ibid. 10.
[16] S. J. Wiseman, "Hairy on the Inside: Metamorphosis and Civility in English Werewolf Texts," *Renaissance Beasts*, ed. Erica Fudge (Urbana, IL: U of Illinois P, 2004) 57.
[17] Sabine Baring-Gould, *The Book of Werewolves* (New York: Causeway, 1973) 90.
[18] Ibid. 89.
[19] Ibid. 96-7.
[20] Davidson 47.
[21] Fudge 52.
[22] Peeter 6-7.
[23] Henri Boguet, "Of the Metamorphosis of Men into Beasts," *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*, ed. Charlotte Otten (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986) 77.
[24] The biblical story of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation into an ox for ten years is a particular favorite among those who discuss human-to-animal transformation in this period.
[25] Boguet 83.
[26] Ibid. 83.

[27] Heinrich Kramer and James Sprenger, "The Malleus Maleficarum (excerpt)," *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture,* ed. Charlotte Otten (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986) 110.
[28] Ibid. 108.
[29] Ibid. 106.
[30] Nicole Jacques-Lefevre, "Such an Impure, Cruel, and Savage Beast: Images of the Werewolf in Demonological Works," *Werewolves, Witches, and Wandering Spirits: Traditional Belief and Folklore in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Kathryn A. Edwards (Kirksville, MO: Truman State UP, 2002) 184.
[31] Also known as *On Witches* in its English editions.
[32] Reginald Scot, *The Discoverie of Witchcraft* (London, 1584).
[33] Davidson 48.
[34] Hirsh 11.
[35] Davidson 52.
[36] For a partial collection of trials from 1423 to 1700, see Davidson.
[37] Smith 267.
[38] Gilmore 4.
[39] Ibid. 191.
[40] Smith 280.
[41] The English translators refer to this famous French historian as "I. Goulart" according to the book's frontispiece.
[42] Davidson 61.
[43] For a more complete collection, see Davidson.
[44] Thomas Blout, *Glossographia: or a Dictionary, Interepreting all Such Hard Words of Whatsoever Language, now used in our Refined English Tongue; With Etymologies, Definitions, and Historical Observations on the Same. Also the Terms of Divinity, Law, Physick, Mathematicks, and Other Arts and Sciences Explicated* (London, 1661).
[45] Helaine Razovsky, "Popular Hermeneutics: Monstrous Children in English Renaissance Broadside Ballads," *Early Modern Literary Studies* 2.3 (December 1996): 7.
[46] I. Goulart, "Admirable Histories," *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*, ed. Charlotte Otten (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986) 41.
[47] Hirsh 5.
[48] Goulart 42.
[49] Ibid. 42.
[50] Ibid. 44.
[51] G. Havers, trans., *A General Collection of Discourses of the Virtuosi of France, Upon Questions of all Sorts of Philosophy, and Other Natural Knowledge, Made in the Assembly of the* Beaux Esprits *at Paris, by the Most Ingenious Persons of that Nation* (London, 1664) 203.
[52] Ibid. 203.
[53] Ibid. 203.
[54] Ibid. 204.
[55] Ibid. 204.
[56] Ibid. 205.
[57] Michel Jeanneret, *Perpetual Motion: Transforming Shapes in the Renaissance from da Vinci to Montaigne* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001) 105.
[58] Ibid. 2-3.

[59] R. W. Maslen, "Myths Exploited: The Metamorphoses of Ovid in Early Elizabethan England," *Shakespeare's Ovid*, ed. A. B. Taylor (Cambridge UP, 2000) 18.
[60] Jeanneret 106.
[61] Wiseman 52.
[62] Hirsh 34.
[63] Ibid. 13.
[64] Ibid. 8.
[65] Scot 69.
[66] Ibid. 74.
[67] Ibid. 76.
[68] Ibid. 78.
[69] James I, "Men-Woolfes," *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*, ed. Charlotte Otten (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986) 128.
[70] Technically there are six speakers, but the figures Exorcistes and Pneumatomachus make no notable contributions to the discussion.
[71] John Deacon and John Walker, *Dialogicall Discourses of Spirits and Divels* (London, 1601) 159.
[72] Ibid. 161.
[73] Ibid. 162.
[74] Ibid. 162.
[75] Jacques-Lefevre. 194.
[76] Hirsh. 30.
[77] Ibid. 30.
[78] Robert Burton, *Diseases of the Mind* (London, 1621) 6.
[79] Ibid. 6.
[80] Ibid. 6.
[81] Ibid. 6.
[82] Robert Bayfield, *Της Ιατρικης Καρτοσ or A Treatise De Morborum Capitis Essentiis & Prognosticis* (London, 1663) 49.
[83] Lynn Enterline, "'Hairy on the In-side': *The Duchess of Malfi* and the Body of Lycanthropy," *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 7.2 (1994): 96.
[84] John Brinley, *A Discovery of the Impostures of Witches and Astrologers* (London, 1680) 18.
[85] Ibid. 20.
[86] The modifier English is used here because there were certainly dramatic representations of mythology in Graeco-Roman society, but relatively few play scripts have survived.
[87] Jeanneret 116.
[88] Fudge 51.
[89] Jacques-Lefevre 197.
[90] Jennifer Richards, "Introduction," *Early Modern Civil Discourses*, ed. Jennifer Richards (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003) 1.
[91] Jacques-Lefevre 195.
[92] Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (New York: Oxford UP, 1993) 26.
[93] All *Duchess* quotations are from: John Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi and Other Plays*, ed. Rene Weis (Oxford UP, 1998).
[94] Briggs 23.

[95] Katherine A. Edwards, "Introduction: Expanding the Analysis of Traditional Belief," *Werewolves, Witches, and Wandering Spirits: Traditional Belief and Folklore in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Kathryn A. Edwards (Kirksville, MO: Truman State UP, 2002) xiv.
[96] Jacques-Lefevre 186.
[97] Wiseman 61.
[98] Hirsh 27.
[99] Fudge 56.
[100] Courtney Lehmann and Bryan Reynolds, "Awakening the Werewolf Within: Self-help, Vanishing Mediation, and Transversality in *The Duchess of Malfi*," *Transversal Enterprises in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: Fugitive Explorations*, ed. Bryan Reynolds (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006) 236.
[101] Enterline 103.
[102] Ibid. 113.
[103] William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus 1594*, The Malone Society Reprints, Vol. 166 (Oxford UP, 2003).
[104] John Ford, *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, ed. Derek Roper (London: Harper & Row, 1975).
[105] Shakespeare 74.
[106] Leslie Dunton-Downer, "Wolf Man," *Becoming Male in the Middle Ages,* eds. Jeffrey J. Cohen and Bonnie Wheeler (New York: Garland, 2000) 205.
[107] Charles Perrault, "Little Red Riding Hood," *Perrault's Complete Fairy Tales*, trans. A. E. Johnson (New York: Puffin Books, 1999) 69.
[108] The sexualized undertone to the tale comes out in Perrault's moral. It also appears in the fact that the murder occurs in a bed. Some scholars have argued for blatant sexuality based on Riding Hood removing her clothes before joining the wolf in bed, most versions simply say that she removed her cloak, a sensical gesture equivalent to removing her coat or jacket.
[109] Ruth Bottigheimer, "Fairy Tales and Children's Literature: A Feminist's Perspective," *Teaching Children's Literature*, ed. Glenn Edward Sadler (New York: MLA, 1992) 101.
[110] Bengt Ankarloo and Gustav Henningsen, eds, *Early Modern European Witchcraft: Centres and Peripheries* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990); Robin Briggs, *Witches & Neighbors: The Social and Cultural Context of European Witchcraft* (New York: Penguin Books, 1998).
[111] Maslen 18.
[112] An excellent example of this use of the genres is the debate over cloning and genetic engineering, which has been going on in science fiction for decades without causing significant controversy, while so-called mainstream genres of fiction and non-fiction have just started catching up in the last few years and have caused controversies of one sort or another.
[113] Edwards xv.
[114] Perrault 66.
[115] Ibid. 67.
[116] Jane Yolen, *Touch Magic* (Little Rock, AR: August House, 2000) 25. For a strong feminist reading, see: Marshall, Elizabeth. "Stripping the Wolf: Rethinking Representations of Gender in Children's Literature." *Reading Research Quarterly* 39.3 (2004): 256-270.
[117] Jack Zipes, "A Second Gaze at Little Red Riding Hood's Trials and Tribulations," *The Lion and the Unicorn* 7/8 (1983-84): 80.
[118] Ibid. 93.
[119] Ibid. 95-6.

[120] Sharon P. Johnson, "The Toleration and Erotization of Rape: Interpreting Charles Perrault's 'Le Petit Chaperon Rouge' within Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century French Jurisprudence," *Women's Studies* 32 (2003): 330.
[121] Children's views are debatable, see: Yolen, Jane. *Touch Magic*. Little Rock, AR: August House, 2000. and Le Guin, Ursula K. *The Language of the Night*. New York: Berkley Books, 1982.
[122] Johnson 331.
[123] Bronislava Kerbelytê, "Why the Literary Interpretation of a Tale is Not Popular?: Little Red Riding Hood," *Folklore* 34: 31-38.
[124] These include: Rudyard Kipling's "The Mark of the Beast" (1890), Clemence Housman's *The Were-Wolf* (1896), Guy de Maupassant's "The Wolf" (late nineteenth-century), Eugene Field's "The Werewolf" (1911), Saki's "The She-Wolf" (1914), Gerald Bliss' "The Door of the Unreal" (1920), Seabury Quinn's "The Phantom Farmhouse" (1923) and "The Thing in the Fog" (1933), Fritz Leiber's "The Hound" (1942), Jack Williamson's *Darker Than You Think* (1948), Jane Yolen's "Green Messiah" (1988), Charles de Lint's *Wolf Moon* (1988), Tanith Lee's *Lycanthia* (1990), and Patrick Jennings' *The Wolving Time* (2003).
[125] See Charlotte Otten, ed., *The Literary Werewolf : An Anthology* (Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 2002) for an excellent sampling of short stories from some of these authors: August Derleth, Kipling and Saki to Fritz Leiber, Jane Yolen, and Stephen King among others.

# CHAPTER 3

## The Disc's K-9 Unit

When Pratchett extracts a new lifeform from the jars of folklore and horror fiction in his basement, it joins the Watch. (Amanda Cockrill, 2006)[1]

### Pratchett's Werewolves

Throughout his writing career, Terry Pratchett has continuously argued in favor of the power of stories, the literary venue for archetypes. From a witch/fairy godmother's attempt to make the world fit fairy tales (*Witches Abroad*) to the importance of telling a story at the right time (*Thud!*)[2], this firm belief has lurked, sometimes more blatantly than others, beneath the surface humor and satire in all of his novels. Approaching the entire corpus of Pratchett's Discworld work—currently including thirty-eight novels, fifteen printed theater adaptations, four collections of maps, seven short stories, twenty

miscellaneous works, and three novels rumored to be in production[3]—is a daunting task. Even attempting to summarize the body of his work is a task best left to its own book. Surprisingly, save for the work of a few individuals (notably Andrew Butler and Andy Sawyer), Pratchett has not generated as much scholarly commentary as his significant and complex corpus might be expected to stimulate. His subject matter ranges through pieces written for young adults and adults to his recent Discworld books for a younger audience—*The Amazing Maurice and His Educated Rodents* and the Tiffany Aching trilogy. The range of his work includes such issues as gender equality (*Equal Rites*), the power and artificiality of fairy tales (*Witches Abroad*), religion and faith (*Small Gods*), jingoism and national fervor (the aptly named *Jingo*), the benefits and drawbacks of the internet (*The Fifth Elephant* and later Ankh-Morpork focused books), the power and danger of a free press (*The Truth*), the role and power of music and celebrity (*Soul Music*), and racism/ethnic cleansing (*Thud!*). Along the way, Pratchett not only references a great number of archetypes, myths, legends, and folklore, but also pays homage to various literary notables and pop culture celebrities. Among these individuals and works are Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (*The Light Fantastic*), *Phantom of the Opera* (*Masquerade*), *Doctor Faustus* (*Eric*), Robert E. Howard's Conan (*Interesting Times* and *The Last Hero*), the Mad Max movie series (*The Last Continent*), and even Ian Fleming/Neil Gaiman (through Messers Pin and Tulip in *The Truth*).[4] Of this impressive corpus of work, two novels stand out for their portrayal of the werewolf archetype: *The Fifth Elephant* and *Thud!*

The links of influence between this popular writer of fantastic fiction and the tradition I have described thus far is not necessarily a scholarly, or documented, set of explicit references but rather the conscious development of "timing" in his storytelling. Pratchett employs this "timing" to subtly reintroduce old tropes into new stories. Each traditional trope and archetype appears in a new story that reflects major issues or cultural trends that are occurring in our own world. Further, in evoking traditional literature, legend, folklore, and popular culture, he taps into the influence and power that he sees in stories as well as the collective unconscious. Thus, we should not be surprised to find that Pratchett introduces werewolves and other manifestations of the shape-shifter archetype into the Disc. As Caroline Walker Bynum states about the medieval period, shape-shifting is about process and story. Because of this role, Pratchett's werewolves naturally undergo a continual metamorphosis from their first appearance and they appropriate medieval and early modern traditions in an effort to re-fashion the werewolf archetype to "speak" to modern readers. After all, Pratchett is a self-described "vast consumer of folklore"[5] who sets his stories in "the largely imaginary world of Discworld."[6] In this case, he uses the phrase "largely imaginary" because so much of the fictional world is drawn from the everyday world.[7]

His werewolves are no exception, nor should we be surprised that werewolves provide a focus for some of his satirical novels. As Jeffrey Jerome Cohen noted in his study of monsters, "The co-option of the monster into a symbol of the desirable is often accomplished through the neutralization of potentially threatening aspects with a liberal dose of comedy."[8] In the case of his werewolves, Pratchett neutralizes their threats by

reminding the reader that the differences between wolves and dogs are minimal, especially throughout both *The Fifth Elephant*[9] and *Thud!*[10]

This same comedy is employed so that, as Cockrell contends, "we don't notice what serious stuff he is talking about until it's at our throats,"[11] namely Pratchett's discussions of racism, nationalism, religious fundamentalism, and the continuous technological revolution. The last of these four is the most important in that the technological revolution is not only daunting in and of itself but it is also a symptom of another of Pratchett's continual themes: the inevitability of change. This idea that change is both unavoidable and constant becomes a problematic topic due to its implication that stability and rest are impossible. Within this tension between constant change and the desire for stability appears Pratchett's comic tone in the form of the werewolf, a figure that itself struggles with the same tension. To cope with the tensions inherent in both theme and figure, Pratchett introduces comic moments as his characters attempt to do the best they can in a confused world. At the same time, this comic tone allows Pratchett to conduct socially relevant discussions in a non-threatening fashion, much as Samuel R. Delany did in the 1960s.[12] In other words, the comic tone attempts to address the tension between the old and the new in a disarming manner.

Specifically dealing with werewolves, Pratchett draws from such "serious" material as Marie de France, Albert the Great, and *William of Palerne*. In an inversion of Marie de France's *lai*, Pratchett presents the exception to the rule first—the sympathetic werewolf—then introduces the ferocious part of the population. However, this apparent inversion, seen in a cultural context, is not truly an inversion since Pratchett's readers are

already familiar with both the *garvulf* and the *bisclavret*. Because the former is more readily apparent in folklore and film, Sergeant Angua is introduced as the exception to the cultural rule and Marie's order of introduction remains intact. Pratchett also consciously draws upon Gerald of Wales to provide subtle hints and clues. He adapts medieval criteria for bestiality versus humanity. For the most part, save in Angua's brother Wolfgang, he bypasses early modern traditions in favor of blending the medieval literary and early-twentieth century film traditions that better inform his storytelling and modern reactions to the archetype. Moreover, his werewolves are clear manifestations of the shape-shifter archetype as it evolves through the twentieth and into the twenty-first centuries. As part of this evolution, Pratchett uses his werewolves primarily to discuss racism/ethnic animosity, the nature-versus-nurture debate, and social building. He does this through Angua, an expansion of the figure not only as a female police officer (although she is a noblewoman), but also as a self-reflective werewolf—a figure that is unique to the modern, post-Freudian/Jungian era—and her family.

## Bisclavret's Influence

Two Discworld books that focus on the werewolves are: *The Fifth Elephant* (*Elephant*) and *Thud!* Of the two, *Elephant* presents the most involved and detailed look

at werewolves through Sergeant Angua and her family, the von Überwalds. *Elephant* is also the novel in which Pratchett most obviously employs classical and medieval elements such as loss of clothing, breaking social structures and associations with cannibalism, off-screen transformations, and an interrogation of the medieval criteria for humanity.

Like Petronius' and Marie de France's, Pratchett's werewolves lose their clothing when they transform. Most presumably remove whatever they are wearing before changing forms, but this is never explicitly stated. Unlike classical and medieval versions, Pratchett's werewolves think about this necessity and express different opinions of it, which fall along gender-based lines. Sergeant Angua and her mother, Serafine, embrace clothing—the one as uniform, the other as finery, both as a sign of humanity and civilization. In fact, when she is wolf-shaped, Angua "kept clenched in her jaws the little leather bag that was a friend to any thinking werewolf, such a creature being defined as one who remembers that your clothes don't magically follow you."[13] This bag contains a lightweight change of clothes and a bottle of mouthwash. Her father—Guye Ruston von Überwald, more commonly simply called "the Baron"—and brother—Wolfgang (Wolf)—eschew clothing when possible. The Baron rarely wears more than a tattered dressing gown and always appears uncomfortable in any clothing. But he also spends most of his time "Changed" into wolf shape. Wolfgang, at least around the family castle, wears nothing, claiming "Clothes are unhealthy. [. . .] Nakedness is purity."[14] For Wolfgang, the animal side is stronger and better than the civilized. Indeed, he uses the

word "civilized," in many variations, as a sneering insult. His one concession is that he dons a military-style uniform for official functions outside the castle.

This mix of militarism and savagery is representative of Wolfgang's roots in the classical and medieval traditions not only because of the clothing issue, or the connection to Petronius' soldier-werewolf, but also through cannibalism. There are a number of moments in *Elephant* where Pratchett implies that Wolfgang and his pack engage in cannibalism. Only once is this explicitly stated, the other moments all involve allusions to what happens when someone loses "the Game"—an event in which a pack of Überwald's werewolves choose a victim and chase him/her through the woods. The clearest statement of what happens to losers comes from Wolfgang, who says, "if they *don't* outrun us . . . the question of money does not arise!"[15] The obvious implication is that losers are eaten by the pack. This is supported by Captain Carrot who says to Angua, "If he *lost*, then your father had him for dinner out in the woods."[16]

The combination of militarism and wildness also ties Wolfgang to Marie de France's fables, especially since he is a member of the nobility. Here, Wolf supports Marie's use of wolves as representatives of nobility gone awry. Like these fable wolves, Wolfgang works with his pack of werewolf relatives to bring down the existing social structure in Bonk—a three way balance—swinging it in his own favor. Although there is no central authority figure, such as a king, to oppose, the balance of power itself acts as an authoritarian status quo that can be fought against. His sister, Angua, on the other hand, acts as an agent of the law with her own mismatched, heterogeneous pack to uphold the social balance and the existing structure of power. What is telling here is that

Wolfgang's associates are a homogenous group. Not only are they all werewolves, but they are also all relatives—Angua names a sampling: Uncle Ulf, Aunt Hilda, Nancy, and Unity. They are all representatives of the rising power, the rebels who wish to take over. Angua's "pack" is a more diverse collection of individuals—a dwarf (Constable Littlebottom), a troll (Constable Detritus), and several humans—who represent a cross-section of the species living in Bonk and Überwald in general. The only Überwaldian species not represented in this makeshift pack are the vampires, none of whom join the Watch until *Thud!*

Pratchett's werewolves also bear some resemblance to Albert the Great's depiction of wolves although the religious concepts attached to werewolves do not appear in his work. Both through Angua (the *bisclavret*) and Wolfgang (the *gar-vulf*), they are shown to be fierce, cunning, crafty, and social. These qualities appear during the two Games that are shown in the narrative, the first involving Mister Sleeps the initial ambassador, the second involving Commander-Duke Vimes, Angua's boss. Their social nature continuously comes to the forefront as well, sometimes more subtly than others. Wolfgang's socialization is rather blatant in that he only appears in the company of others—his family, his pack, or social events. Angua is a little less obvious, although still noticeable. When she travels from Ankh-Morpork to Bonk, in wolf shape, she does so with a variety of wolf packs. But this is only a temporary arrangement. For long term sociability, we need to look at the fact that Angua attaches herself to a close knit sub-community, the Watch. In both *Elephant* and *Thud!*, she is constantly surrounded by

fellow watchmen, and usually the same core group: Fred Colon, Nobby, Vimes, Carrot, Littlebottom, Detritus, and (later) the vampire Sally.

Initially we might suggest that many of these connections and those that follow could be subconscious or inadvertent. However, Pratchett hints that he knows what he is doing in *Elephant*. In a brief moment in which none of the werewolves are present, nor any discussion of them occurs, Constable Visit-The-Infidel-With-Explanatory-Pamphlets takes a moment to quote "the prophet Ossory,"[17] named for the Irish kingdom from whence Gerald of Wales' werewolves came.[18] Taking this subtle clue, present in a narrative focused on werewolves, and adding Pratchett's clear understanding of folklore, it is a reasonable assumption that any connections between his werewolves and earlier conceptions of them are made consciously.

Although the actual allusions to medieval writers in Pratchett's work are interesting, the narrative devices that he chooses to use are of greater interest and importance. Pratchett deploys two major medieval narrative devices regarding the werewolf archetype: off-screen transformations and their appearance during times of transition.

Like Bisclavret, Alphouns, and Gorlagon, Pratchett's werewolves change shape "off-screen." Even though this is not always literally true, since they sometimes shift forms where others can see them, they are effectively off-screen because the other characters rarely watch. Even when Pratchett chooses to have a character change "on-screen," as it were, he uses vague language to describe the transformation, unlike late-twentieth century film and horror fiction. There are only eight points where Pratchett

mentions a werewolf changing shape in *Elephant* and only one in *Thud!* The first of these occurs when Seraphine von Überwald tells her husband to Change when he comes inside, at which point, "The wolf gave her a look, and strolled behind a massive oak screen at the far end of the room. There was a . . . noise, soft and rather strange, not so much an actual *sound* as a change in the texture of the air."[19] The baron steps out from behind the screen a short time later. The second involves Angua and a wolf friend of whom is said: "They returned twenty minutes later. Angua was human again - at least, Gaspode corrected himself, human *shaped*."[20] A while later, traveling with the wolves and Carrot, "she walked back again, doing up her shirt"[21] after changing shape again off-screen. All three of these incidents fit within the medieval tradition, as represented by Marie de France, *William of Palerne*, and *Arthur and Gorlagon*.

The other five instances do not fit in so neatly, but still take place out of sight. The first of these occurs when Wolfgang and his pack are chasing Vimes during the Game. After running for a time, the wolves catch up with Vimes. In order to taunt him, "Wolf took a deep breath. The other werewolves, sensing what was going to happen, looked away. There was a moment of struggling shapelessness, and then he was rising slowly on two feet."[22] In this case, it is the other werewolves who either do not want to see the moment of transition or have some respect for privacy. Vimes watches, but he does not relate any notable details, rather leaving the process to the audience's imagination. He has another chance when he is attempting to drown a member of the pack. At that point, "it *Changed* . . . It was as if the wolf shape became small and a man shape became bigger, in the same space, at the same time, with a moment of horrible

distortion as the two forms passed through one another."[23] This is the clearest description of the lycanthropic transformation that Pratchett ever presents. While he refuses to provide as much detail as many horror writers, in some ways the vague descriptions are more horrifying and effective because they leave room for the reader to apply the imagination to the process. This is the climax of Pratchett's description of the transformation. From that point forward, his descriptions become vague again, such as "there was a sudden moment of morphological inexactitude,"[24] "in midair he changed into a wolf" (and back again),[25] and "When werewolf fights werewolf, there are advantages to either shape. It's an eternal struggle to get a position where hands beat claws [. . .] The mind has to fight its own body for control and the other body for survival."[26] In *Thud!* the only transformation is simply described as "She went back to human to get down; claws were fine, but some things were better done by monkeys."[27] During this scene, Angua is alone with no witnesses to her transformation.

As with the medieval sources they reflect, these transformations can remain vaguely described because the transformation itself is not what is important to the character, the author, or the audience. The fact that the character *can* transform is what is important. It is this ability, not how it looks when it is used, that calls up the questions regarding transition, humanity, and identity that are so central to werewolves in particular and the shape-shifter archetype in general. The specifics of the transformation might be important to a writer in the horror genre, but even then leaving the appearance vague, as most of the descriptions in *Elephant* are, can produce the desired effect much better than a detailed description.

On a related issue, Pratchett's werewolves, like their medieval ancestors, appear at times of transition and change. Just as Marie's and Gerald's appeared and became popular during a time of social change, the characters in *Elephant* herald a significant social transition. They also appear on the cusp of a major technological transition, the introduction of the clacks—a semaphore tower system that mimics the telephone or internet—to Überwald. This technological innovation brings about obvious social and economic changes as information passes from one end of the continent to the other within a day, linking solitary and insular Überwald to the rest of the world. At the same time, a moderately progressive dwarf king is elected, causing another social shift that more conservative elements in that society oppose, working in league with Wolfgang.

Likewise, as *William of Palerne* and *Arthur and Gorlagon* became popular in the fourteenth century, a time of considerable social, economic, and theological change, the characters in *Thud!* are involved in a highly significant social and quasi-theological transition that reflects similar changes in our own world, as will be discussed later. In this case, the werewolf archetype appears to help bring about peace and social understanding between the Discworld's dwarfs and trolls, who had been at war since the dawn of both races. This transition involves the message of the dwarf "god" Tak and the dying words of the hero/semi-divine B'hrian Bloodaxe as well as Diamond, one of the quasi-god-kings of the trolls, all of whom call for peace and understanding between the two races. The game for which the novel is named serves here as a shared middle ground, safe territory in which the two races can meet, talk, and socialize. For both races the transition is one of borderline religious significance, revising creation stories that they

held with religious reverence, not unlike the evolution-creation debate that forms a crux in our own society. In the case of the events in *Thud!*, the debate centers on history versus religion, much as the science versus religion debate in our own culture involves history, or rather pre-history. This connection is tied strongly to Pratchett's discussion of timing and story. And through this connection, unlike the fourteenth century's introduction to the Reformation, Pratchett's key werewolf helps to usher in a religious and social reunion rather than acting as a sign of difference and monstrosity.

As with any socio-theological changes, questions of identity arise for those whom the transition affects and thus cause the archetype to manifest. One of the key elements of identity is the cultural definition of humanity. When we look back to medieval definitions of humanity, we find the four criteria identified by John Block Friedman and used by teratologists in the later part of Middle Ages: clothing, diet, speech, and choice of weapon(s), sometimes including reason. If we apply these criteria to Pratchett's werewolves, the sample characters involved rest on both sides of the human-animal divide. As discussed above, the werewolves' views regarding clothing are varied—for the Baron they are an unwanted necessity; for Wolfgang they are a sign of weakness; for Seraphine clothing is a sign of respectability, self-fashioning, and means of hiding the wolf; and for Angua the Watch uniform is a means of controling the beast within through self-fashioning. Diet also produces mixed results—the Baron and Wolfgang occasionally eat people; Angua not only never eats people but also pays for the chickens she otherwise steals in the city; and the reader is left with little knowledge of what Seraphine eats. There are implications that the baroness hunts and eats raw game, however, since Lady

Sybil (Vimes' wife) thinks "the food here tasted as though it had been cooked by someone who had never even *tried* before. She'd seen the kitchens, when Serafine has given her the little tour, and they'd just about do for a cottage."[28] In these ways, and those that follow, we see most of Pratchett's werewolves unleashing or capitulating to the non-rational forces that a medieval audience assumed directed a beast's actions. Meanwhile, Angua resists these influences to the best of her ability, even to the point of resisting them for others near the end of *Thud!* where she prevents Vimes from acting upon such urges.

Speech is a clearer indicator in that all of the werewolves possess the ability to speak, after a fashion, while in their wolf shape. They also prove to have the ability to speak to wolves while in their human shape. This is most clearly shown when Angua, in wolf shape, claims Carrot in order to save him from the wolf pack she travels with: "'*Hmine*,' growled the wolf. It was Angua."[29] She and her mother perform similar speech actions elsewhere as well. Even this fairly clear indicator of humanity is only a single step forward, and not a very large one. The human-animal question, for a medieval audience, takes a greater step back when we address the question of choice of weapon(s) and use of tools. Angua, as a member of the Ankh-Morpork Watch, automatically straddles the border even before taking her species into account. Looking back to Friedman's criteria, all members of the Watch carry the sword that ties them to the upper classes, the civilized people. But they also, because of their job, carry a truncheon or club, which places them in the non-human or sub-human strata of the medieval social/biological hierarchy. This puts the Watch in the middle ground occupied

by the werewolf archetype, and explains one reason for Angua's presence among them. She becomes a representative of the borderline place the Watch occupies regardless of the species of individual members. Vimes places the werewolves squarely in the non-human category, however, when he considers Wolfgang and his pack. For a moment, he thinks, "Werewolves didn't [need weapons]. Even Angua hesitated before reaching for a sword. To a werewolf, a physical weapon would always be the *second* choice."[30] Of course, since he immediately becomes involved in an unarmed fight with a werewolf, his own position on the scale is also questionable at that point.

All of these criteria for humanity versus bestiality return to the core question of identity. As Caroline Walker Bynum says of medieval werewolf tales, "Behind these fantastic stories lie probing, parody, and evocation of that glorious, inexplicable, and (to postmodern eyes) totally improbable thing: identity"[31] whether the question involves the mind-body, inner-outer, or biological-social. In the case of Pratchett's archetypal werewolves, we see this crisis of identity most clearly in the character of Sergeant Angua. Since she is a self-reflective werewolf, she provides a unique perspective in both *Elephant* and *Thud!* The identity crisis is non-existent for the male members of the family, as evidenced in *Elephant*. Angua's brother embraces both morphological sides of his being, although he sometimes has trouble deciding which form is appropriate. He breaks the human-animal binary by accepting himself as the hybrid werewolf. Their father, on the other hand, largely embraces the wolf while their mother appears to accept the wolf so long as it remains controlled by the trappings of human civilization, in other words, a dog. We may initially think that Seraphine then has come to terms with her

shadow and exerted control over it. But, she has not done so, she merely hides the shadow because she has not undertaken the psychological search and mediation necessary to truly reconcile the shadow.

Angua, contrary to the rest, is shown constantly struggling with the human-beast identity problem. She wrestles with her shadow in an honest attempt to tame it. This occurs in large part because Angua has left the society that the rest of her family inhabits. In effect, she stands in for Gerald's werewolves, if he met them in London instead of the Irish wilderness. She becomes the civilized, tamed werewolf that, unlike Gerald's, works to reinforce the status quo (even as she, by the natureof her species, breaks down an important wall) instead of introducing unsettling doctrinal questions. Rather than remaining at home where werewolves are a fact of life and are expected to act in certain ways, she went to the big city and experienced a different way of looking at things.[32] During her travel from Bonk to Ankh-Morpork and back, she was required to travel through wolf territories, which enhanced a certain sense of understanding of her borderline place, as she tells Carrot, "Humans hate werewolves because they see the wolf in us, but wolves hate us because they see the human inside."[33] For Angua, the problem of identity is compounded with the fact that Pratchett never lets the reader forget that there is only a marginal difference between wolves and domestic dogs. For the moment, it suffices to say that in general Angua plays the part of the loyal dog, in much the same way as Bisclavret, Alphouns, and Gorlagon relate to their chosen humans—king, William, and brother-king respectively, which is especially apt since Carrot may be the rightful king of Ankh-Morpork.

## Discworld's Renaissance

The influence of early modern views regarding werewolves on Pratchett's work is minimal. He does not connect his werewolves to his witches, and indeed they have separate story arcs that have not yet intersected. Nor does he connect his werewolves to madness, at least not in the way that early modern demonologists did, since his werewolves actually change form rather than simply believing that they do. On the other hand, Wolfgang and the Baron certainly have their own sort of madness, but this has no notable effect on their status as werewolves.

That said, his werewolves do have a few similarities with early modern conceptions. The von Überwalds are connected to the author's and audience's interest in beginnings, change, and creation. Most of these beginnings and acts of creation involve social and technological change. In another connection, while the religious element is omitted along with the ties to witchcraft, like the early modern werewolf, Pratchett's are generally considered monsters, at least outside the cosmopolitan cities such as Ankh-Morpork. There they become mere curiosities, or useful tools and friends as in Angua's case. This attitude ties Ankh-Morpork even closer to London given Anglo-Scottish academic approaches to lycanthropy during the early modern period. Likewise,

according to Pratchett as in the earlier sources, a werewolf's bite does not transmit werewolfism on the Discworld. While they differ as to the causes of lycanthropy—madness or consorting with demons versus genetics—they do agree on that point. Pratchett, at least in *Elephant*, is also interested in describing the mechanics of his werewolves, or the rules that govern their existence and behavior, just as many early modern demonologists were obsessed with the mechanics of lycanthropy in their own era.

Of the four major werewolves that Pratchett presents, Wolfgang is the closest to the early modern Continental version. He even has some ties with the moralized uses to which English authors put the werewolves of their own era in that he provides a threat within society which acts as a rallying point for otherwise disparate segments of the nation. That is, Wolfgang functions to threaten the social and political body through his half-baked plots, in part because of his position as the baron's son and the fact that his plots, if successful, would drastically shift the balance of political power in his homeland. *Elephant* focuses on Wolfgang's transgressions of the rules and mores of society. Angua appears for balance, another werewolf acting as a representative of law and order (along with Vimes) to uphold both the rules and society as a whole. In this way Wolfgang functions in the same way as Ferdinand in that he becomes a metaphor for social ills (in-breeding of the aristocracy), loss of values (Angua tells Carrot that her father played the Game by the rules while Wolfgang does not), and social depravation or degeneration.

There are an equal number of aspects that work against the early modern concepts beyond those already noted. For instance, Pratchett's werewolves do not require any

external tools to change their shape. The fact that they are forced to change within a few days to either side of a full moon is the trade off, or Pratchett knows Gervase of Tilbury's theory or drew that aspect from later cinematic sources. Unlike the early modern versions, Wolfgang needs to be in his wolf shape for his execution. Were he not in that shape, the execution would take a different and perhaps much less effective form. Because of this, Wolfgang loses his chance to recognize his transgression and repent, even though Vimes very vocally goes through the arrest procedure. Finally, unlike Boguet and other early modern versions, only in a few cases are there outward signs by which a human can detect a Discworld werewolf.[34] As Angua says, "Wolves have got a very good sense of smell. You can't fool it. I can pass for human, but I can't pass for wolf."[35] This ability to pass, to pretend to be human or "normal," is one point where we see both the modern threat and edge of fear that the werewolf evokes in some modern audiences as well as the negative effect of self-fashioning by which the monster can pass as a normal part of society.

Like the accomplished horror author or many early modern writers, Pratchett never actually shows his werewolves killing anyone, though the reader knows they have done so. This in itself provides a layer of fear response, but no more than we would expect from any other villain (and only the villainous werewolves kill people). So, in our post-agricultural society, what then causes the werewolf to remain a staple of the horror and fantasy genres? In a post-1960s world in which organized terrorism is commonplace, the individual who wishes to destroy society and can pass undetected becomes a significant source of fear. The roots of this role can be seen in the early modern period

through Catholics in England and the Germanic states or Protestants in Spain and France, those who look like everyone else but wish to attack the perceived foundations of society. In much the same way, the modern literary werewolf (especially the female werewolf) that questions many of the binaries and divisions upon which society is built threatens invisibly from within, whether intentionally or not, as is the case with both Wolfgang and Angua.

## Angua, Wolfgang, and the Archetype

Based on the aforementioned roots, we can see that Pratchett's werewolves exhibit many of the key characteristics of the greater shape-shifter archetype, including their role as civilizing figures, as reminders of humanity's bestial nature, as signs of the mutable world, as representatives of the nature-versus-nurture debate, and through their affinity with the Jungian shadow. Whether consciously or not, Pratchett presents multiple sides of each aspect, especially in *Elephant*, that work to explore and dissect the archetypal traits through a process of comparison.

The previous discussion of medieval and early modern elements in Pratchett's werewolves already touches upon their role as civilizing figures. However, there is more to this aspect of the archetype and its expression in these works than noted thus far.

Clearly Wolfgang serves as did the wolves in Marie de France's fables, as the monster that acts as an example of the forbidden and socially unacceptable. He civilizes the audience first by performing anti-social, uncivilized actions, then by being punished for his transgressions. In this case, it is important to note that his transgressions against civilization were punished while he wore the form of the uncivilized. Not only does this wolf form and means of punishment (being executed while playing fetch) act to "other" Wolfgang (a nobleman effectively disowned by the nobility), thereby making him a scapegoat representing all the problems of Überwald's society, but it lets the audience, both fictional and real, know that society was threatened by a beast, the wolf simultaneously beyond and within its borders. The human, the urban, is kept intact.

His mother, on the other hand, acts to civilize in a different way. Even while she is being intimidated by her son and turned toward his purposes, she attempts to maintain some degree of civilization within their family and home. Seraphine undertakes this mission through the use of clothing—see her attempts to keep her husband and son dressed, cited above—and the other outward trappings of culture and refinement, such as the finishing school she attended with Lady Sybil and her attempts to maintain a level of decorum in her home (including her requirement that her husband be in human form when he is inside, which does not always happen). In the latter case, more often than not she is forced to rely on social niceties of speech and social gatherings rather than cuisine and decoration—the former discussed above, the latter is shown in the minimalist furniture and lack of expected decorations around the castle (no armor or swords on the walls, for instance). Because of these limitations and the fact that they are simply a thin

veneer, Seraphine ultimately fails to civilize anyone, even her own husband and son. Her daughter, though, makes the same attempt on a larger scale. By the very nature of her profession, Angua functions as a civilizing force. Since she works to enforce the various rules and structures that make society possible, she acts to civilize others on a broader scale than her mother, and with fewer restrictions. Because of this, and because Angua honestly and actively attempts to control her own wild, bestial side, Pratchett allows her methods to be successful—for instance, every time she and Wolfgang have a fight, he turns and flees, thereby showing civilization triumphant; this is especially demonstrated when Vimes finally, and "accidentally" executes him. Wolfgang's continuous defeats and ultimate execution place him as the representation of the archetype that allows for violently transgressive acts, both in his attempted fratricide and in his disruption of the social order. In this way, through his execution, the audience can vicariously attempt both acts safely within the realm of fiction and fully understanding the consequences.

Even with this civilizing factor, the werewolves, as with all human-animal shifters, function to remind the audience of humanity's own bestial nature and the inevitability of change. This aspect is clearly demonstrated by the very nature of the beasts, as it were. To paraphrase Angua's statement, humans hate werewolves because they sense the beast within. Of course, that very beast also attracts people to werewolves and the archetype. Another clearly depicted trait worth mentioning again is that these werewolves, through their hybrid human-beast nature, act as signs of a mutable world. They appear during times of social, political, technological and theological change and work to either help or hinder that social evolution. Werewolves, and other shifters,

appear at such times to represent our ambivalent feelings regarding points of transition—the simultaneous attraction and repulsion that these historic moments evoke. Because Pratchett's werewolves represent the police (Angua) and the nobility (her family; also a reference to the Ossory werewolves),[36] they fulfill the archetype's paradoxical role as a point of stability within their own mutability. That is, these unstable creatures represent structures that maintain order, even as they are directly involved in effecting a social evolution. For the purposes of *Elephant* and *Thud!*, the technological/social change invoked may be likened to that caused by the explosion of the Internet while the socio-theological change in *Thud!* can be seen as parallel to the fall of the Soviet Union. Although both are imperfect analogies, as most analogies are, they will work well enough for our purposes. Just as the rampant expansion of the Internet has created ambivalent feelings—excitement at the connectivity and information access potential mixed with fear and concern regarding privacy and predators—the Disc's clacks call up similar excitement and concerns. Likewise, as the fall of the Soviet Union brought about a historic moment when former rivals became, at least for a time, friends, *Thud!*'s revelations bring together two old enemies in an atmosphere of trepidation (including concerns about trust) and excitement (the knowledge that one is part of a deeply historic moment). Again we see the archetype manifesting itself at a point of re-birth and new beginnings. In *Elephant*, this is the beginning of a new social order and re-birth of a society that involves greater equality across five different species and political ideals (not counting the Igors). *Thud!'s* beginning, re-birth, is more fundamental, and thus we see

greater ambivalence regarding the change, in that it brings about a new relationship between two otherwise irreconcilable species, or nations.

This ambiguity translates itself into the debate over the influence of an individual's nature versus upbringing. Once again, Pratchett presents arguments from four major directions in *Elephant*. Most of Angua's family appears as an even mix of inherent, wild, nature and learned behavior—the Baron acts upon his werewolf nature in spending most of his time as a wolf and follows learned behavior, for instance through upholding the traditions of the Game. Seraphine generally leans toward the upbringing end of the continuum, and it is a sliding line rather than a hard binary, in Pratchett's treatment. Wolfgang mixes both, as a combination of his parents, but tends toward the side of nature since there is little to account for the degree of his wildness based on the behavior of his parents and sister. Angua, like her brother, moves toward the nature side of the spectrum, although in a different way. Rather than connecting with her nature as a werewolf, something she does her best to control, she does what she can to tie herself to her nature as an individual. This comes out especially well in *Thud!* In the case of all four werewolves, Malcolm South's assertion that "Fabulous creatures reflect both the dark and the bright side of human nature"[37] rings true.

Not only does South's statement partially explain the role of Pratchett's werewolves, but it also explains their affinity with the Jungian shadow. Wolfgang has clearly embraced and been consumed by this aspect of his psychology, giving in almost entirely to the anti-social behaviors that make up the shadow. His parents, on the other hand, deny their shadows, using traditions, animal shape, and the veneer of civility to

cover up and excuse this darker side. The only family member who accepts this aspect of her psyche, realizes its purpose, and attempts to deal with it is Angua. Throughout both *Elephant* and *Thud!* she acknowledges the darker, anti-social, side, but does what she can to fight it off or channel it. Like Vimes whose shadow is personified in *Thud!* as the Summoning Dark, Angua struggles with her internal darkness. While Vimes creates his own mental persona—the Watchman, or Guarding Dark—Angua uses various small things to keep the uncivilized side at bay, for instance, she pays for any chickens she 'steals' around the city or elsewhere, "Because animals don't."[38] In this way, she becomes psychoanalytically healthy while her relatives remain in need of assistance.

## Lycanthropic Mechanics of the Disc

Like many earlier writers, Pratchett is interested in the rules, limits, and mechanics that govern his werewolves. He is very concerned with the morphology and physiology of his werewolves, at least as regards their transformations, as a means of discussing both their otherness and similarity to his human audience. This interest appears in the classical and medieval authors—the insistence upon rituals or clothing—in a less systematic or obvious way than some of the early modern writers, but it is still a long tradition. The tradition continues throughout Pratchett's work, and later Rowling's,

alongside an interest in the mechanics and limits of magic, witchcraft, and other important aspects of his "largely imaginary" world. The rules governing Discworld's werewolves, at least those currently featured, fall into three categories: abilities/vulnerabilities, reproduction, and the effects of long term Changing.

Pratchett indirectly mentions several different abilities his werewolves possess, from regeneration to the obvious shape-shifting. The two he most directly discusses are what happens when the werewolf loses control of his/her shifting, and the sense of smell. What happens when a werewolf who can Change loses control of his ability? Pratchett answers that question through Wolfgang. Just before he and Angua attack each other, Wolfgang is described as follows: "Wolf ears sprouted from a head that was still human. His hair had grown around him like a mane. Patches of fur were tufted on his skin. [. . .] The rest of him . . . was having trouble deciding what it was. One arm was trying to be a paw."[39] This scene, including the fight, shows that, according to Pratchett's conception, a certain amount of conscious or unconscious control is necessary for the werewolf to maintain a given shape. It also speaks to Wolf's psychological turmoil, his hybrid nature and instincts finding morphological expression.

Of equal importance, though, is the werewolf's sense of smell, especially in regard to Angua's job. In this respect, Pratchett describes Angua as seeing with her nose: throughout the entirety of *Thud!* he uses the verbs "see" and "smell," in various conjugations, interchangeably for her. The reader is told, during an investigation that "Angua tapped her nose. You couldn't argue with a werewolf's nose,"[40] even if she is in her human shape. This particular trait, which can be overcome,[41] is virtually a necessity

for her role in the Watch, where it is typically used to investigate crime scenes, and therefore to police society's rules/norms.

Even werewolves' regenerative abilities are limited, as Angua explains to Vimes, "it wasn't fire or silver [. . .] It probably hurt a lot, but we heal amazingly well."[42] This echoes an earlier thought that Vimes had when he was told that Überwald's dwarfs do not mine silver: "where you got werewolves, didn't you need silver?"[43] This focus on silver reflects a more modern sensibility, probably drawn from the horror genre, both literature and film, rather than the earlier written sources. It is also a necessity in that transgressive werewolves need to be punished, so they must have some exploitable weakness.

Reproduction is another important area that Pratchett touches upon, both notable moments question how the lycanthropic ability passes on genetically. In the first, Angua tells Carrot and the audience that "a werewolf that doesn't Change"[44] is referred to as a yennork.[45] She explains that "that's where the fairy tale monsters come from. People with a *bit* of wolf and wolves with that extra capacity for violence that is so very human."[46] In addition to adding more layers of Wolfgang's villainy—he killed their yennork sister and drove away their yennork brother—Pratchett's inventiveness works to heighten the reader's suspension of disbelief. It does so because the post-Darwin reader, presumably, knows that sometimes certain traits are not genetically passed down to children, even if both parents share them, though the potential remains for the next generation. Therefore, the modern audience understands that lycanthropy could be one of these traits and this makes the manifestation of the archetype more acceptable to the audience. The other moment involves Vimes considering Angua's relationship with

Carrot: "Vimes wasn't sure what the result was if a human and a werewolf had kids. Maybe you just got someone who had to shave twice a day around full moon and occasionally felt like chasing carts."[47] This concern is also, indirectly, raised by medieval authors as demonstrated by Bisclavret's wife and her reaction to learning that he was a werewolf. On one hand, the wife's response could be considered in light of the introduction to the *lai*. On another, it could be concern for any children she might have with her baron-husband. Similar concerns are also raised by Rowling, as we will see later.

In Pratchett's conception of the archetype, the Change can occur whenever the werewolves wish. However, his work reveals certain problems with reverting from one shape to the other or remaining too long in one form granting preference to one side of the hybrid nature. Regarding the former, he writes that "For a second or two after Changing, they're not entirely up on current events."[48] A few seconds of disorientation make sense, further acting as a means of suspending disbelief, while the mind adjusts to the new body. Interestingly, this particular drawback is ignored during the fight between Angua and Wolfgang. But, the more important aspect, for Pratchett and the archetype, involves the identity problems associated with remaining in one shape for too long. He provides ample evidence of the degenerative process caused by remaining a wolf for extended periods of time through both the Baron and Wolfgang. During the Baron's introduction, he is shown acting dog-like and responding to questions in single word growls because of spending "too much time Changed"[49] into a wolf. He is also seen in his human shape attempting to act like a wolf or dog in that he tries to scratch behind his

ear with his leg and forgets how to use utensils. Both he and Wolfgang are described as being very hairy in their human shapes as well. Whether this is due to Changing often or because they are males is unclear—Angua and her mother do not share this trait, but also do not Change as often in the narrative. Wolfgang, for instance, is described as being noticeable by "the slight lengthening of the incisors, the way the blond hair was so thick around the collar,"[50] but again, this may be due to his father's genes or being male. Vimes provides the last comments on the effect of spending too much time Changed, stating "in either shape, a werewolf slowly lost some of the skills of the *other* shape [. . .] The human part started to lose control"[51] after a time as a wolf.

These conditions are important both for the suspension of disbelief through continuity—thereby making the archetype more acceptable to the modern audience—and because they return to the idea that monsters of all sorts conform to certain rules. With a subject as broad in folklore, mythology, and legend as the werewolf, each author picks and chooses which rules his/her werewolves will follow from the past and whether new rules will be added to the old, as we will see again with Rowling in the next chapter. These rules, especially for Pratchett's werewolves, function to determine or frame the core issue of identity and nature. That is, they denote and transgress the boundaries of the self-identification problem inherent in werewolves of all types. They guide the discussion and help form the forum in which that all important debate occurs.

## Of Wolf and Dog

One of the other ways in which Pratchett deals with the dual nature of the werewolf archetype is to constantly remind the reader that the line between wolves and dogs is a thin one. As the talking dog, Gaspode, says, "I could've *bin* a wolf, you know. With diff'rent parents, of course."[52] This approach simultaneously heightens the potential threat of the werewolf and provides a comedic effect that neutralizes the threat. The threat is increased because the audience is familiar with domesticated canines, and being reminded that there is minimal difference between the canines in our homes and those in the wild can be unsettling. On the other hand, when Pratchett's werewolves react like the dogs we see in homes around the world, the comedic effect then disarms the threat.

Reminding the audience that wolves and dogs are not all that different is something that Pratchett returns to many times during both *Elephant* and *Thud!* This reminder is more pronounced in *Elephant* largely because there are more werewolves present and they are the central characters. The balance between human and animal that the werewolf and the dog represent in *Elephant* is displayed to the audience notably through the characters: Vimes, Gaspode, the Baron, and Wolfgang. The concept makes its appearance in Vimes' thought regarding Wolfgang: "but something between a human and a wolf has a bit of dog in them."[53] This statement is supported by Gaspode who states, "Dogs're a lot nastier than wolves."[54] The latter statement refers to the

aforementioned violence that Pratchett, through Angua, says is particular to humanity. Since dogs have picked up some human traits through domestication and training, according to Pratchett's view, they themselves can be considered partial werewolves and are certainly hybrid creatures. Thus comes the nastiness Gaspode refers to and his thought "This is me [. . .] stuck between the humans and the wolves,"[55] exactly the same position in which Angua and the other werewolves find themselves. Through this sort of statement and his constant hints that domestication actually makes canines more threatening, Pratchett subtly increases the potential threat represented by his archetypal werewolves. If, he implies, we find werewolves threatening because they are part man and part beast, should we not also find the domestic dogs we live with equally threatening? After all, his talking dog "took it as an article of faith that there was in all dogs a tiny bit of wolf."[56] Since most of Pratchett's audience has likely never seen a wolf before, but is probably familiar with threatening dogs, the wolf and werewolf as threat become more relevant.

Even as he asks this difficult question, Pratchett undermines the threat posed by his werewolves. The thin line between wolf and dog, we find, works both ways. Just as the dog can seem wolf-like, fierce, and nasty, the werewolf can appear quite puppy-like. For instance, after greeting Vimes, the Baron "let go of his hand and flung himself onto the huge carpet, the excited dogs piling on top of him."[57] Vimes, we find, refers to the canines as dogs simply because they are indoors, acknowledging that he would probably refer to them as wolves if they were outside. During the same scene, Pratchett shows the von Überwalds reacting like dogs to certain words, such as having problems saying the

name "Vetinari," due to the "vet" syllable. Because of this, when Vimes next uses the Patrician's name, he put "a slight stress on the first syllable and [heard] the growl on cue."[58] Likewise, whenever the word "bath" is used around the werewolves, Pratchett makes sure to note that they grimace, yelp, growl, or otherwise react negatively. Although these traits and reactions might not be amusing or disarming in and of themselves, coming from a pair of nobles, both of whom are "monstrous," they cause the audience to relax for a moment. The reactions of the nobles are what we would expect to see in our household pets; therefore, when the baron and baroness wince at "bath" or "vet," we smile or chuckle and they become less threatening. This disarming effect continues when Littlebottom tells Vimes that "Werewolves like to sleep in front of the fire at night, sir."[59] Then, just as the audience becomes comfortable with the amusing baron and his wife, Pratchett introduces the von Überwald family motto—"Homo Homini Lupus,"[60] which has relevance in our own world. This brings the audience back to the seriousness of the plot and position that the main characters are in, although soon after, Pratchett uses Lady Sybil to allow another smile and reminder of dog-like qualities as she tells Vimes, "Werewolves hate cats."[61]

The combination of threat and disarming amusement (a paradox worthy of the archetype) also appears in *Thud!* through Angua, usually in relation to receiving praise or showering. Those reactions, due to her self-reflective role, are shown in the context of self-identification, rather than being performed by characters whose thoughts the audience does not see. Because of that key difference, Angua's dog-like responses and attributes will be discussed later.

Pratchett takes these traits beyond their amusement level, and beyond the level of neutralizing the potential threat of lycanthropy through humor. In *Elephant*, these dog-like traits that provide disarming amusement also serve as tools used by the everyman, as represented by Vimes,[62] to execute Wolfgang for his social misbehavior. After assuring himself and everyone else that Wolfgang is guilty of social misconduct and that he is resisting arrest, Vimes produces a flare/firework tube and preys upon the werewolf's domestic dog traits:

> The mortar jerked as the charge went off and its payload came out tumbling slowly and trailing smoke in a lazy spiral. It looked like the stupidest weapon since the toffee spear.
>
> Wolfgang danced back and forth under it, grinning, and as it passed several feet over his head he leapt up gracefully and caught it in his mouth.
>
> And then it exploded.[63]

Here we see Pratchett taking the very qualities he used for humorous effect earlier and twisting them. Rather than merely being a source of amusement, they become a source of identification with the monsters that fit within society. Since the audience can recognize the canine traits, a point upon which the audience can sympathize with Wolfgang is brought about at the very moment his character is removed from the narrative. The traits then gain another layer as they become a defense against the monster that threatens society. In case the reader missed the significance of the scene, Vimes refrains from such Bond-esque comments as "fetch," although he considers a few. Then, to further underscore the point, Pratchett adds a character telling Vimes, "*Clearly* you

were not to know that he would automatically try to catch the . . . explosive [. . . ] The . . . doglike qualities of a werewolf would hardly have occurred to a man from the big city,"[64] despite the fact that Pratchett wants it made clear that Vimes *did* know about those qualities, a fact made sufficiently clear by his earlier calculated references to baths and vets.

This presentation of similarities becomes part of something greater as Pratchett puts his werewolves to a variety of uses. When he expands the role that they play, the wolf-dog dynamic present in his use of the archetype slides smoothly into discussions of racism and related issues.

## Werewolves at Work

Over the course of several novels, Pratchett's werewolves challenge, adapt, or expand a variety of major issues beyond those covered by medieval and early modern lycanthropes. He employs werewolves to portray: racism/ethnicity, self-reflection, expansions on the nature-versus-nurture debate, and social construction–the latter of which occasionally involves comparisons to vampirism. These become the core issues that Pratchett returns to whenever his werewolves, especially Angua, appear.

The role of werewolves as archetype in Pratchett's discussion of racism/ethnicity is rather complex, since he plays not only with human-werewolf relations but also with wolf-werewolf relations. Both cases are used to highlight issues of racism/ethnicity and discuss how or why it functions. Tied to this issue is that of multi-culturalism, an integral connection since the one usually follows or precedes the other. On that aspect, we turn to Angua because, as Cockrell writes, "[t]he Watch [. . . ] skewers the pitfalls of multiculturalism with gentle understanding in its officers."[65] This is especially the case in *Elephant* and *Thud!* in which politics and racism are major themes. Both texts require the audience and the characters to see Angua as something more than just a handy sleuthing nose or Sergeant Detritus (a troll) as more than a simple battering ram. At the same time, *Thud!* presents Vimes, and Angua, forced to deal with a vampire joining the Watch in the interests of political correctness and diversity—a sort of multi-species version of affirmative action.

More directly related to racism, we look at Wolfgang and Angua in their relations with others, both human and wolf, as well as Angua's employment. David Buchbinder has already noted that Wolfgang "has an attitude toward non-werewolf kind that echoes Nazi master-race ideology (complete with a cult of exercise and nudity)"[66] that is evident not only in these two areas but also in the military uniform (made for a non-existent military) he wears to the dwarf reception. Speaking with regard to Seraphine, with whom she went to school, even the likable and positive Lady Sybil adds a layer to this discussion of racism, telling Vimes, "we all knew she was a werewolf, but nobody would ever dream of talking about that sort of thing in those days. Well, you just *didn't*."[67] On

one hand, this language mimics some of that used during the pre-civil rights era in the U.S. It can, however, also be read as language used when discussing a disease. This ambiguity is, I think, intentional, though less so than we will see with Rowling. The ambiguity creates a strong link between the Discworld's view of werewolves and our world's treatment of ethnicity, such as current discussions regarding immigrants in the British Isles.

As part of this discussion, Gaspode and Angua make attempts to justify prejudice directed at werewolves by both humans and wolves. Gaspode argues from both perspectives, as befits his position as a dog between the human and the wolf. He explains to Carrot that, "People don't like wolves that can think like people, an' people don't like people who can act like wolves."[68] Unpacking this assertion calls up a variety of questions, since Pratchett has previously asserted that: humans possess the "extra capacity for violence," and that dogs, being partially human, are "a lot nastier than wolves." If such is the case, what exactly is Gaspode saying? The first half of the statement makes sense based on Pratchett's other assertions. That is, people clearly dislike and fear any wolf that possesses that extra, human, capacity for violence because it makes the wolf more threatening. Not only that, but it also acts as a reminder that humans possess the capacity for cruel violence, while the wolf pack prefers to expend as little energy as possible and bring down prey swiftly, without intent to cause pain/suffering. The second half, though, becomes problematic until we apply humanity's perception of wolves rather than scientific reality. Because civilized humans, in general, do not wish to appear vicious and fierce these traits are transferred to the wolf, or other

animals, and deemed bestial. The characteristics are then dubbed "anti-social" and those who possess them are cast out of society, unless the traits are channeled into entertainment or the military. Even then, limits are put in place—sports rules, codes of conduct—and society as a whole reacts when the limits are violated. The desire to forget and ignore our own violent heritage and the shadow aspect of our psyche has clearly been present for centuries, as evidenced by medieval and early modern attempts at denial such as Gerald of Wales' attempt at transference (shifting the bestial away from the English to the Irish) or use of the Plinian races to move bestiality away from Europe as a whole. It can also be seen in our own world if we employ Jane Yolen's replacement technique.[69] If we remove troll-dwarf, for instance, and insert Serb-Croat, Greek-Turk, Hutu-Tutsi, Irish Catholic-English Protestant, Sunni-Shi'ite, we see our own stereotypes of violence being created to justify acts of even crueler violence, as mirrored in Pratchett's writing. However, this is only one layer of Pratchett's application of the archetype to racism.

Gaspode and Angua both argue the wolf side as well. Gaspode's brief foray into this aspect of prejudice is to say quite simply, "Wolves hate werewolves [. . .] And she smells wrong. Wolves are very sensitive to that sort of thing."[70] The position he expresses is that, since humans do not like werewolves, even when they look human, it makes sense that wolves would not like werewolves, even when they look like wolves. This argument returns to the earlier assertion about wolves that think like people, rephrased by the reader as "Wolves don't like wolves that can think or act like people." Since, in Pratchett's world, most of the mammals have some degree of intelligence and at least limited access to reason, this line of reasoning makes sense within the narrative.

Left solely to Gaspode's view of the relationship, though, the prejudice seems largely unreasoned, illogical, and summed up as werewolves "smell wrong." Angua presents a better, more rational, explanation. She eventually tells Carrot that "it's always wolves who suffer when werewolves get too powerful. Werewolves are smarter at escaping hunters [. . .] Vampires leave them alone. Werewolves sometimes *hunt* wolves."[71] While Pratchett never explicitly explains why they hunt wolves, the implication of previous statements indicates that the reason is the human part of their psyche, the part that hunts not for survival but for pleasure and simply to kill something. The same can be said of the Game, since neither Wolfgang nor the Baron need to maintain the Game for survival. As nobles, they have access to power and food, but they continue the Game in part to remind the populace of their power and in part because of that streak of uniquely human nastiness that both Angua and Gaspode allude to.

Ultimately, Pratchett sets himself firmly on the side of racial/species co-existence through the following exchange:

> "I never shook hands with no king before," said Detritus. "No dwarf, either, come to that."
>
> "You shook hands with me once," said Cheery.
>
> "Watchmen don't count," said Detritus firmly. "Watchmen is *watchmen*."[72]

While this exchange passes between a troll and a dwarf, it can just as easily be applied to any of Pratchett's hybridized Watch characters. Pratchett's message is clear: while racial prejudice exists in the wider world, there are some places, some sub-cultures, in which it either is being eradicated or has been erased.[73]

A related trait that Pratchett introduces, compared to classical through early modern sources, is his primary werewolf's capacity to be self-reflective. This post-Freudian trait allows the reader to appreciate the werewolf's thoughts and views, as well as speech about herself, rather than simply his/her actions, as was the case with the earlier sources. For instance, on the prejudice issue noted above, Angua reflectively muses, "When werewolves make trouble, it's the *real* wolves that always suffer. People'll kill anything with fur."[74] Most of these thoughts, whether vocalized or internalized, are related to her construction of identity, as we might expect, and they vary from commentaries on werewolves to humans to vampires, the three most important species that come into her mind throughout the narratives.

Much of the reflection on werewolves involves her identity as a being split between two worlds and known as a monster, an integral part of the archetype. With this in mind Angua states, "We're not nice people, Carrot. We're all pretty dreadful."[75] That she includes herself in this generalization is interesting in that from her introduction in *Men at Arms* through *Elephant*, Angua has worked for the Watch and has been in the group of characters that, if not exactly good, at least try to do what is best for society, whether society wants their help or not. Even so, at that point, Pratchett shows Angua identifying herself with a base, stereotyped, nature rather than with what she has accomplished since leaving Bonk. Much of her self-reflection needs to be viewed with some skepticism. For instance, she claims, "We *always* leave people somewhere to run,"[76] even though her actions during what amounts to a sting operation with Corporal Nobbs at the beginning of *Elephant* show otherwise. There is some justification for her

apparent contradiction of words and actions since she tells Carrot, "Being two things at the same time, and never quite being one . . . we're not the most stable of creatures."[77] In this single statement, Angua reflectively states the core problem and nature of the shape-shifter archetype in general and werewolves in particular: the instability that is simultaneously exciting and frightening for both the individual and society.

This duality is also central in the use of the werewolf as a focus for expanding the nature-versus-nurture debate. In the case of the werewolf, the duality means that the animalistic side cannot be expunged. Instead, that natural side becomes controlled, tamed, and subordinate to society through learned behaviors. But this characterization oversimplifies a complex relationship presented indirectly even as far back as Ovid and Petronius. With Angua's self-reflective moments, questions of controlling nature through upbringing or vice versa are explicitly spelled out for the reader, as are the gut level responses evoked by the lycanthropic figure. While these latter responses are greatly tempered, based on the popularity of werewolves and wolf-like beings in both the literary and cinematic horror genre, I think it is safe to say that they are still present.

Throughout her appearances in the Discworld books, Angua is depicted as constantly struggling to either subsume her bestial side or balance the wolf with the human. Usually she is successful, though there are some uncontrollable aspects, such as when she states "I have to sleep in a dog basket seven nights a month"[78] around the full moon. Associated with this Change is what Pratchett calls pre-lunar tension (PLT), an obvious analogue to pre-menstrual syndrome (PMS), since his primary werewolf is female (although his male werewolves also suffer through this state). While the lunar

induced Change is uncontrollable, at least Pratchett's werewolves have a choice in how they spend that week[79] without the need for external aid, unlike Rowling's as we will see later. The problem comes to a head with Angua's thoughts, such as "She ought to have at least another day! [. . .] Bits of her body *wanted* her to become a wolf, right now."[80] In order to combat this uncontrolled Change, Angua finds other ways to escape the werewolf nature, as she and others see it. The aforementioned paying for chickens is one of these methods. Another is, as Carrot muses, "Very meticulous about cleanliness, Angua. That's not usual in werewolves."[81] Many of her werewolf traits come to light along with Angua's early appearances, but many of her attempts to master these urges come later. The references to chickens and cleanliness appear after her character is well established in the series, shortly after she and Carrot develop a romantic relationship. The debate reaches its apex during *Thud!*, though, with the introduction of Constable Sally, the new vampire watchman.

With the introduction of Sally, Pratchett decides to play with the recent resurgence in popular culture of vampire-werewolf animosity, drawing from medieval eastern European legends[82] and modern movies.[83] The very first scene involving both characters features Angua thinking "All she could do was grin and bear it and fight down a pressing desire to rip out the girl's throat with her teeth."[84] Unlike some other modern recapitulations of this animosity, Pratchett does indeed make it a natural, biological, instinct rather than a socially understandable one. Instead of constructing a history fraught with revenge or other social conflicts, he takes a biological route, implying that the animosity exists because both species compete for the same prey: humans and

presumably dwarfs. The fact that neither werewolves nor vampires require human prey does nothing to curb the competition, especially since Pratchett introduces a league of vampires reminiscent of Alcoholics Anonymous but regarding blood. Interestingly, this animosity does not appear in *Elephant*, although there are also no scenes in the book that show werewolves and vampires together, even if one scene implies that a vampire might have helped Wolfgang.[85] The hunting methods employed by the two species add to the problems—the suave, debonair vampire versus the animalistic werewolf. Because of this, Angua reminds herself, "Don't start believing you're stupid and hairy. Think clearly. You *do* have a brain."[86] This relationship acts as a window into the civilized-savage tension that the werewolf archetype represents, that which humanity does its best to balance on a daily basis as well, though not so literally as the literary werewolf.

The vampire-werewolf relationship is not the only window that Pratchett opens into the werewolf-human psyche. Another returns to his reminder of the thin line between wolf and dog, wild and civilized. This aspect generally takes three forms: reception of praise, expected behavior, and dealing with baths. In *Thud!* each of these forms occurs in relation to Carrot or Sally and all of the incidents appear in the form of Angua's internal or external speech.

The first two areas where the wolf-dog dynamic appear tend to overlap with each other and can be summed up in two scenes: in the first, Angua receives praise from Carrot (her superior officer and significant other) and in the second, she pauses to share her thoughts regarding vampires. Once Carrot praises Angua for finding a particularly useful clue, Pratchett tells us that "Under her flesh, she felt her tail want to wag. She

wanted to lick his face. It was the dog part of her thinking. You're a good dog. It was important to be a good dog."[87] There could be the potential for some commentary on gender here, until the critic recalls that in *Jingo*, Vimes, also known as "Vetinari's terrier," tells Angua that everyone is someone's dog. What is more important is that the general reaction is not unique to Angua, nor to Pratchett's werewolves. The specific manifestation of the reaction is certainly unique to Angua, but virtually every other character in the books responds to Carrot in the same general way. Therefore, her specific reaction is a manifestation of the werewolf's canine nature, but it is also a representation of a typically human response to both a charismatic leader and a loved one. The fact that she does not act upon the urge is also significant for the archetype in that it shows that natural impulses can be restrained when necessary.

In the second instance, Angua thinks about werewolves and their relation to vampires. During this introspective moment, she thinks "Never mind that, because everyone *knew* that a creature that was a wolf and a human combined was a kind of dog. They were *expected* to behave."[88] Beyond acting as another reminder about the dog-wolf divide, this thought reveals a perception that the civilized is supposed to outweigh and overrule the wild. The human part is supposed to influence the wolf and create a being that behaves socially and maintains the niceties and laws that keep the social structure running. Ironically, since people are perhaps unique in the animal kingdom in being able to act either selfishly or with the interests of the pack in mind, the wild wolf aspect is more likely to be the socially responsible aspect of the werewolf. This hearkens back to Gaspode's comment about dogs being nastier than wolves because of their association

with humans. The thought also reveals a probable reason for Pratchett's primary werewolf to join the Watch. If a werewolf is supposed to be a kind of dog and dogs are supposed to behave, then where better for that reasoning, sentient, dog to work than the police? This structure also, in Angua's case, provides a level and source of discipline that her brother lacks at home. Therefore, in Angua's case, positive self-fashioning wins out over nature. Whether she would agree with this assertion is another matter, since when she is corrected by Sally about the nature of her relationship with Carrot—that she is his, not the other way around—her response is simply, "It's a werewolf thing. We are what we are!"[89] On the other hand, Wolfgang and the Baron clearly personify the nature side of the equation, as the vampire Margolotta ironically suggests to Vimes, "It must be so hard for a werewolf [Seraphine], realizing that she's raised a monster [Wolf]. As for the baron, give him a bone and he's happy for hours."[90]

One of the last ways in which Pratchett deals with nature-versus-nurture through the wolf-dog dynamic is with Angua's reactions to showering. Her initial reaction, when questioned by Sally about her reluctance to shower—after both spend a night tramping through mud filled tunnels—is "It's full moon, okay? The wolf is a bit strong."[91] In keeping with Pratchett's minimal triumph of nurture over nature, she does eventually step in, pretending that the shower is merely falling rain. However, afterwards, she thinks "The important thing now was to remember to use a towel and not to shake herself dry."[92] Pratchett resists the scene, as does Angua, thus showing nurture triumphant.

Perhaps the proverbial final word on the wolf-dog divide is Angua's thought about werewolves:

> Well, they were just sad monsters, weren't they? Never mind that life was a daily struggle with the inner wolf, never mind that you had to force yourself to walk past every lamppost, never mind that in every petty argument you had to fight back the urge to settle it all with just one bite.[93]

This particular thought is another reminder of subconscious, biological thinking mastered (at least briefly) by the conscious, socialized part of the psyche. The triumph of the socialized over the shadow occurs through constant struggle. There are, however, points where Angua plays with the subconscious instincts of others through her abilities as a werewolf to aid her position as a watchman.

Both of the major scenes where the audience sees this effect come when Angua attempts to keep someone immobilized after tackling them in her wolf shape. In the first instance, Done It Duncan, having just been caught purse snatching, notes that "Something right by his ear started to drool. And there was a long, very long drawn out growl, not changing in tone at all, just unrolling a deep promise of what would happen if he tried to move."[94] Here Angua takes up the stories, fears, and collective unconscious reaction that werewolves, and wolves, evoke in people and uses them to her advantage. She appeals to this deep seated, one might say genetic, impulse later, in order to keep Vimes safe from himself. In that scene, after tackling him, "Angua drooled. The hair along her spine stood out like a saw blade. Her lips curled back like a wave. Her growl was from the back of a haunted cave. All together, these told the brain of anything monkey-shaped that movement meant death."[95] Not only do these scenes evoke deep instinctive responses, which help to explain the audience's simultaneous fascination with

and fear of the werewolf and archetype, but they move into a corollary to the wolf-dog dynamic. The scenes serve to remind the audience that just as the wolf became the dog, the monkey that the wolf hunted became the human. Not only that, but the impulses that drove the monkey are not, according to Pratchett, extinct and are not buried all that far down in the human psyche. We can conclude from these scenes, and the wolf-dog dynamic that Pratchett constantly refers to, the werewolf also functions as a symbol of evolution, a concept that Pratchett has referred to several times throughout the series and clearly assumes his audience accepts. This assumption builds a community out of the audience, just as his werewolves serve to build a society in the novels.

Part of any society is a shared sense of justice and order. Edith Benkov could have had Angua in mind when she asserted that the werewolf was a "[s]ympathetic character whose 'beastliness' will both serve justice and restore a certain order, albeit one which is different from that at the outset of the tale."[96] She was talking about Bisclavret, but the statement is even more applicable to Pratchett's Angua. In both *Elephant* and *Thud!*, Angua is portrayed as a sympathetic character. She uses her wolf side to serve the Watch, the representatives of law and order. Both tales involve her working with others to undermine an older social order in favor of a newer, more modern one (supplanting a feudal state with an emerging Athenian democracy). The old order in *Elephant* is that in which Überwald consists of "large areas controlled by feudal vampire and werewolf clans,"[97] while the new order allows for the country's dwarfs and humans to have a say in their own government. The laws of the new order allow for enforcement which reins in the depredations of the old order, as represented by Wolfgang and his pack. Admittedly,

the old order did create the present society through its depredations, especially the Game, which Wolfgang tells Vimes is the source of initial funding for most of the businessmen in the country.

The form of social building practiced by Wolfgang and his father, though, and that which Angua eventually takes part in through *Elephant*, follows David Gilmore's formula of appearance for the monster. Initially the monsters—the werewolves especially—appear from the shadows and are disbelieved or discounted. Wolfgang restarts the Game, without the traditional rules, but is largely ignored by the populace of Bonk and is effectively encouraged by his parents. The depredation and destruction perpetrated by the monster leads to an awakening in the community. This awakening is represented in the person of Tantony, one of Bonk's watchmen, with Vimes acting as a catalyst. Eventually, the community reacts and unites under a hero-saint. This particular point is a tricky one for *Elephant*. The community in Bonk does not publicly unite as such. However, various members secretly help the hero-saint, represented by a conglomerate of watchmen—Vimes, Carrot, and Angua. In this way, the Ankh-Morpork Watch in general, and Angua in particular, work to build a new society out of the old, even if that society is initially held together by fear of a particular individual. Sally's appearance in *Thud!* provides evidence that the new society flourishes, since she arrives as a vampire and member of the Bonk Watch, ostensibly coming to learn from Vimes and his heterogeneous family. The fact that she also comes to the Watch as a spy for the dwarf king adds evidence for a working society left in the wake of Angua and her compatriots.

The community in Bonk is not the only society built or reinforced by Pratchett's primary example of the werewolf archetype. By the very nature of her role as a watchman, Angua acts to build and influence Ankh-Morpork's social fabric through enforcing the rules by which that society defines itself and works. She also helps to create a sub-society in the Watch itself, involving a collection of disparate elements from humans to werewolves, dwarfs to trolls, gnomes to gargoyles, golems to zombies, vampires to Nobbses.[98] This sub-community acts as a hybridized pro-diversity society in and of itself, which serves as an example for the society that contains it. As Pratchett said through Detritus, species, race, and ethnicity do not matter to this society because "Watchmen is *watchmen*."[99]

## Watchmen to Teachers

In Pratchett's hands, the late-twentieth and early twenty-first century manifestation of the werewolf archetype comes to represent racial/ethnic minorities and social builders. As the figure evolves to deal with these traits and issues, Pratchett never loses sight of the long tradition that brings the werewolf into the modern day. His werewolves have clear ancestors among the medieval sources, from Bisclavret and Alphouns to Gorlagon and the werewolves of Ossory. They share the medieval

avoidance of explicitly witnessed transformation and continue the medieval/early modern quest for identity, especially for a human identity as different from, or encased in, that of other animals. At the same time, he draws from early-twentieth century cinematic sources and the subconscious as represented by the connections between his werewolves and the shape-shifter archetype. Even though he largely ignores the early modern tradition, certain echoes can still be found, such as his interest in the mechanical and psychological aspects of how werewolves work and the rules that govern them.

A significant part of Pratchett's popularity around the world is his storytelling method, use of older traditions, and tapping of the collective unconscious. Readers find various things that they recognize from folklore, fairy tales, legends, myths, literature, popular culture, and current reality in his work. His readers enjoy this sense of familiarity and the game of finding his sources. As an example of this relationship with his readers, Pratchett relates an incident from a book signing in which an Indian family approached him: "Did I know, the mother asked, that the world turtle is part of Hindu mythology? Er, yes, I said . . . er . . . did they mind? They beamed and said no, that was fine, and now would I sign their books?"[100] The fact that his readers work to unpack the various sources Pratchett draws from enhances his importance as a writer. In the process of unpacking his sources, his readers incidentally discover the various serious subjects and positions hidden beneath the layer of humor which the satirist uses to convey his lessons regarding ethnic tension, social problems, change, and story.

Pratchett's archetypal werewolves move beyond these traditional roots, not only through the representations they embody, but by the methods they use to achieve the

same goals. From Angua's self-reflection to Pratchett's constant reminders of the close link between wolves and dogs, these methods serve as a reminder of the narrow line between humans and other animals in ways that the earlier sources do not employ. We see similar methods in another late-twentieth and early twenty-first century author, J. K. Rowling, and her werewolves, as represented by Remus Lupin and Fenrir Greyback. Even so, the methods vary even more, as do her werewolves' functions. Although Angua works to shape society by catching and punishing transgressors of the social rules, Lupin works to pass those very rules on to others at a young age through his work as an educator. This difference creates a modified social dynamic: whereas Angua occasionally employs leaping on transgressors and tooth-and-claw fights, Lupin remains level headed and denies his violent, bestial side, at least when the audience actually sees him. Where Pratchett's lessons come from the educating author through a police officer, Rowling's come through an educator who remains both borderline pedantic and slightly aloof at the same time as he befriends both the title character and the audience.

[1] Amanda Cockrell, "Where the Falling Angel Meets the Rising Ape: Terry Pratchett's Discworld," *The Hollins Critic* 43.1 (Feb. 2006): 10.
[2] In this case, Samuel Vimes' reading the story *Where's My Cow?* to his son at the same time every night. The novel itself can be likened to the timely productions of *Lysistrata* that have occurred from 2001-2007.
[3] All produced since 1983, though his non-Discworld publications go back to 1963. Lspace: Discworld & Pratchett Wiki. "Bibliography." 31 July 2007. 16 September 2007. <http://wiki.lspace.org/wiki/Bibliography#Novels>.
[4] These latter two characters clearly mimic Messers Croup and Vandemar in Gaiman's *Neverwhere* as well as Croup and Vandemar's predecessors in Fleming's *Diamonds are Forever* (at least in the film version).
[5] Terry Pratchett, "Imaginary Worlds, Real Stories," *Folklore* 111 (2000): 159.
[6] Ibid. 160.
[7] For instance, his primary city, Ankh-Morpork, is very obviously London while Klatch is substituted for a mix of France—as in "pardon my Klatchian" or the Klatchian Foreign Legion—and North Africa—geographically, in that it is a large desert against the sea—confusingly, Quirm stands in for France geographically, and even the conception of the world—a flat planet resting on the backs of four elephants standing on a turtle—comes from numerous mythologies.
[8] Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, "Monster Theory (Seven Theses)," *Monster Theory: Reading Culture,* ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (Minneapolis, Minn.: U of Minnesota P, 1996) 18.
[9] *The Fifth Elephant* chronicles a complex plot that mixes semi-traditional fantasy with the police procedural detective story. The commander of the Ankh-Morpork city watch, Sam Vimes, is sent to Bonk, Überwald as an ambassador (he is also, unwillingly, the Duke of Ankh-Morpork). His troupe of attendants/assistants include his wife, two constables (Detritus and Littlebottom, a troll and dwarf respectively), and a civil servant/assassin. The plot revolves around the rise of a new, only moderately conservative, dwarf king and the disappearance of the previous Ankh-Morpork ambassador. Unbeknownst to Vimes and company, Sergeant Angua and the recently resigned Captain Carrot set off on their own for Überwald. Angua returns home to confront her brother, Wolfgang, while Carrot faithfully, and somewhat naively, follows her. Ultimately, the characters discover that Wolfgang and his pack are working with the ultra-conservative elements of Überwald's dwarven society to undermine the balance of power in Bonk so that the werewolves will increase their position and strength. He is, of course, foiled, which forges stronger ties between the dwarf king and Ankh-Morpork as well as sets the stage for an Uberwaldian watch. The latter becomes important in *Thud!*.
[10] *Thud!* is both the title of one of Pratchett's most recent novels and the chess-like game which the story revolves around–interestingly, in order to win a game of Thud, both players must play first as one side (troll or dwarf), then the other. As the anniversary of the Battle of Koom Valley (the first "official" battle between dwarfs and trolls) looms near, a dwarf is murdered in Ankh-Morpork and a troll is framed. Vimes and the Watch—especially Carrot, Angua, Sally, Detritus, and Littlebottom—quickly become involved in investigating the crime, against the wishes of the dwarfish leadership. At the same time, in the continued interests of diversity, Vimes is forced to hire a vampire to the city watch, in the form of Sally (who is also a spy in the employ of the Uberwaldian dwarf king). The entire novel is a discussion of racism and ethnic cleansing as both dwarfs and trolls attempt to reenact Koom Valley, in downtown Ankh-Morpork. After a great deal of serious discussion, police procedural style action, and a liberal dose of hilarity, the Watch

follows renegade dwarfs to Koom Valley. There, they recover an artifact left by B'hrain Bloodaxe and the troll king, Diamond, which turns the entirety of Koom Valley upside down, as it states that the first battle ended in several games of Thud and a bond of friendship and respect among the participants.

[11] Cockrell. 3.

[12] "Because of the nature of race relations in the 1960s, the publishing industry was unprepared for a Black futurist-fiction author who forced readers to address the lingering legacy of racism. Thus Delany used legerdemain to make his stories socially relevant, yet acceptable to publishers" (129). Also, see my comments above in the Introduction on neo-classicism and tonal complexity. Gregory E. Routledge, "Science Fiction and the Black Power/Arts Movements: The Transpositional Cosmology of Samuel R. Delany, Jr." *Extrapolation* 41.2 (Summer 2000): 127-142.

[13] Terry Pratchett, *Thud!* (New York: HarperCollins, 2005) 165-6.

[14] Terry Pratchett, *The Fifth Elephant* (New York: HarperTorch, 2001) 47.

[15] Ibid. 257.

[16] Ibid. 262.

[17] Ibid. 88.

[18] The Prophet Ossory appears a number of other times—in *Hogfather* and *Jingo*, for instance—as Washpot, a. k. a. Visit, is quite fond of quoting him.

[19] *Elephant*. 47.

[20] Ibid. 147.

[21] Ibid. 262.

[22] Ibid. 265.

[23] Ibid. 268-9.

[24] Ibid. 275.

[25] Ibid. 301-3.

[26] Ibid. 337.

[27] *Thud!* 167.

[28] *Elephant*. 291.

[29] Ibid. 123.

[30] Ibid. 274.

[31] Caroline Walker Bynum, "Shape and Story," *Metamorphosis and Identity*, ed. Caroline Walker Bynum (New York: Zone, 2001) 188.

[32] Some of the texts state that Ankh-Morpork has never been successfully invaded by foreigners, for example, because the natives absorb the invaders and take their money regardless of the newcomers' species, gender, or ethnicity.

[33] *Elephant*. 262.

[34] In fact, in later books such as *Making Money*, Pratchett notes that most of Ankh-Morpork thinks Corporal Nobbs is the werewolf on the Watch.

[35] Ibid. 138.

[36] See John Carey's work regarding Irish werewolves.

[37] Malcolm South, "Introduction," *Mythical and Fabulous Creatures: A Source Book and Research Guide,* ed. Malcolm South (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987) xxi.

[38] *Elephant*. 102.

[39] Ibid. 336.

[40] *Thud!* 63.

[41] See *Thud!*: "Angua normally avoided Igor's laboratory, because the smells that emanated therefrom were either painfully chemical or, horribly, suggestively organic" (14) and "that was the problem with the wolf times; the nose took charge" (165).
[42] *Elephant*. 308.
[43] Ibid. 64.
[44] Ibid. 157.
[45] Similar to Rowling's non-magical wizards being referred to as Squibs, which could be tied to the yennork concept.
[46] *Elephant*. 157.
[47] Ibid. 62.
[48] Ibid. 265.
[49] Ibid. 46-7.
[50] Ibid. 234.
[51] Ibid. 264-5.
[52] Ibid. 76.
[53] Ibid. 256-7.
[54] Ibid. 109.
[55] Ibid. 147.
[56] Ibid. 135.
[57] Ibid. 197.
[58] Ibid. 199.
[59] Ibid. 201.
[60] "Man is a wolf to man."
[61] *Elephant*. 212.
[62] Who began his life as a street kid and Watch constable. He was eventually elevated to the ranks of nobility against his will and nature.
[63] Ibid. 344.
[64] Ibid. 345.
[65] Cockrell. 10.
[66] David Buchbinder, "The Orangutan in the Library: The Comfort of Strangeness in Terry Pratchett's Discworld Novels," *Youth Cultures: Texts, Images, and Identities,* eds. Kerry Mallan and Sharyn Pearce (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003) 181 n 8.
[67] *Elephant.* 31.
[68] Ibid. 115.
[69] Jane Yolen, *Touch Magic* (Little Rock, AR: August House, 2000).
[70] Ibid. 115.
[71] Ibid. 156-7.
[72] Ibid. 359.
[73] To some extent the same can be said of sexism as well, since all members of the Watch are referred to as watchmen. Only Nobby and Carrot ever treat Angua as female, until *The Fifth Elephant* and late in *Thud!* at least when Vimes begins to as well, and a large percentage of the Watch is made up of dwarfs who generally appear physically and psychologically sexless anyway, at least until the later novels in which female Ankh-Morpork dwarfs start being openly female.
[74] *Elephant*. 139.
[75] Ibid. 157.
[76] Ibid. 296.

[77] Ibid. 355.
[78] Ibid. 159.
[79] Or partial week, since the Discworld's weeks have eight days.
[80] Thud! 131.
[81] *Elephant*. 84.
[82] In some of these legends, wolves guard graveyards to keep the deceased in their graves. Alternately werewolves have been associated with tracking and hunting vampires in related legends. Most are associated with Greece, the Baltic region, and Romania. See Adam Douglas' *The Beast Within* and Ankarloo and Henningsen's *Early Modern European Witchcraft*.
[83] Such as the *Underworld* franchise, among others.
[84] *Thud!* 13.
[85] *Elephant*. 346.
[86] *Thud!* 127.
[87] Ibid. 136.
[88] Ibid. 134.
[89] Ibid. 241.
[90] *Elephant*. 347.
[91] *Thud!* 239.
[92] Ibid. 240.
[93] Ibid. 134.
[94] *Elephant*. 20.
[95] *Thud!* 337.
[96] Edith Benkov, "The Naked Beast: Clothing and Humanity in Bisclavret," *Chimeres* 19.2 (1998): 28.
[97] *Elephant.* 15.
[98] While Corporal Nobbs is technically considered a human, he is said to have to carry around a piece of parchment to prove this fact.
[99] *Elephant.* 359.
[100] "Imaginary Worlds." 160.

# CHAPTER 4

## Wolf in Professor's Clothing

Mythology no less than science is necessary to help us define who we are,
to discover where we have come from, and to discern where we may be headed.
(Joseph Andriano, 1999)[1]

### Margins and Medievalism

J. K. Rowling presents one of the clearest examples of the sympathetic werewolf and lycanthrope as archetype in modern literature. True to its form, Rowling presents the paradoxical archetype through the conflicting figures Remus Lupin and Fenrir Greyback. In her exploration of these characters and this archetype, she works through or with the inherent tension between Freudian and Jungian approaches within the figure. Like Pratchett, to whom she has been compared, Rowling also incorporates significant classical, medieval, and early modern roots in her werewolves. However, unlike

Pratchett, she minimizes the pieces of modern cinematic folklore that she adds to the creatures—for instance, silver has no significant effect on her werewolves nor do they possess special healing powers but they do transmit their condition through bites.[2] That said, as with most of the serious issues she introduces,[3] Rowling portrays her werewolves with a certain amount of humor. Beneath the marginal position in which Lupin and Greyback are placed, both as characters and in their fictional world, there are clear connections to the long tradition of werewolves and the archetype stretching back to Petronius' soldier and Ovid's Lycaon. At the same time, she draws upon Marie de France, *William of Palerne*, and *Arthur and Gorlagon* in that her werewolves appear in force during many points of transition. They also reflect the monstrous werewolves of the early modern period as they display Rowling's characteristic focus on the mechanics or rules of her fictional world and connect her work to early modern views of self-fashioning.

Two of the most important aspects of Rowling's writing are the layering effect displayed in her narratives and the role of the margins. The first is most obvious in the layers of readers she has attracted over the span of the Harry Potter series, from children the age of her main characters to older audiences. One of the important (and academically interesting) sub-layers is her incorporation of classical, medieval, and early modern texts, themes, and ideas in an otherwise modern fictional world (the books take place from 1991-1998). This incorporation can be seen from the quasi-medieval wizards with their misunderstanding of technology—a case in point is Arthur Weasley's fascination with the "fellytone" and plugs, which he has studied for years and barely

understands—to such beings as Fluffy the three-headed dog and brief comments about chimerae. The other aspect is the importance, role, and interest in the people she places as marginal figures. Although the eponymous title character and his friends—Hermione and Ron—are clearly the central characters, since the stories are told from Harry's point of view, the marginal characters become just as central, if not moreso, in the minds of Rowling's readers. Among these characters are Harry's low grade nemesis Draco Malfoy, Harry's friend Hagrid, and his surrogate father figures Sirius Black and Albus Dumbledore. Two figures embrace both roles (marginalized characters born of earlier material) more than any of the others: the werewolves Remus Lupin and Fenrir Greyback.

Although Rowling's werewolves return to these earlier traditions and continue to remind us that the monster is, in Joseph Andriano's words, "the familiar Self disguised as the alien Other,"[4] they move beyond the limits and previous functions werewolves have served. Like Pratchett's, Rowling's werewolves are used to discuss intolerance, prejudice, and racism. But as archetypal figures they move beyond that point to bring up questions of morality and moral paradox. They also function as metaphors to discuss diseases such as HIV/AIDS or multiple sclerosis. Lupin brings to bear the role or nature of respect, friendship, and mentoring both as Harry's school teacher (a role he never sheds, even in the last book, four years after he has resigned from Hogwarts) and his parents' friend. Lupin personifies the positive aspects of the shape-shifter archetype and exemplifies a healthy relationship with the shadow while Greyback personifies the archetype's negative aspects and the individual that has been consumed by his shadow.

Perhaps even more importantly, and tied to questions of paradox, this stereotypically violent figure acts through Lupin as a peacemaker and voice of civility more often than not. The combination of intolerance and civility also allows Lupin especially to both support and question socialization while he serves to complicate perceptions of key characters such as Ron, Severus Snape, and Mrs. Weasley. In the process, the juxtaposition of Lupin and Greyback serves to validate M. Kratz' theory that werewolves "articulate an assumption about the possibility of losing one's humanity"[5] and the internal struggles necessary to retain control of said humanity.

## Lycaeon and Bisclavret Modernized

Although proving that Rowling was aware of the classical and medieval werewolf traditions as she created her characters may be effectively impossible, there are some strong pieces of evidence that at least imply familiarity. Heather Arden and Kathryn Lorenz argue that her possible familiarity with the medieval tradition comes from her time studying French at the University of Exeter.[6] This, however, does not appear as conclusive, or as worthwhile a path to pursue, as letting her characters speak for themselves. If we look closely at both Remus Lupin and Fenrir Greyback, the only named werewolves in the books, several connections to the medieval tradition are readily

apparent. One simple connection is that Rowling preserves Marie de France's organization of appearance: the *garvulf* is discussed by reputation first, then the exception to the rule, the *bisclavret*, arrives, before the *garvulf* appears in person. The most important aspects that display Rowling's continuation of the shape-shifter archetype and werewolf tradition are their similarities to the tales—notably those of Petronius, Ovid, Marie de France, and *William of Palerne*—combined with the fact that both the two named werewolves and the single unnamed one appear, as in the medieval cases, at major points of transition. As we should expect from Rowling's body of work, the latter points are heavily multilayered.

As with the medieval tradition, Rowling's werewolves have, as Andriano says about monsters, "come to reflect our various emotions, anxieties, ambivalence" about the wild and our relationship to it.[7] These emotions and anxieties are no less worrisome today than they were millennia ago, especially when we see medical procedures involving animal organs transplanted into humans or discussions of cloning for medical purposes. Lupin and Greyback function to reintroduce the questions and thoughts raised by the aforementioned authors and texts using the terms of humanity and bestiality. Both figures contain the principles in varying degrees, with Lupin acting in a manner more befitting Alphouns or Bisclavret while Greyback speaks to Lycaon and Petronius' werewolf. Both, however, have moments in which they cross into the other's territory. The mirroring line, especially in Lupin's case as the series develops, is hardly fixed.

The two werewolves, for the most part, remain on their own side of the divide. In both cases, Adam Douglas' assertion that "One notable feature of Geraldus' telling of the

story is that his werewolves are innocent victims"[8] is equally applicable to Rowling's tale. The description of Lupin's becoming a lycanthrope, told in *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*[9] and repeated in part in *Half-Blood Prince*, show him to be an "innocent victim" since he was bitten as a child through no fault of his own. While we are not told of Greyback's origins, presumably his story was similar in general points, if not in details. His preference for targeting children, such as Lupin, may be a sign that he himself was attacked as a child.[10] After they had this unwonted condition thrust upon them, the two victims took themselves in different directions. Lupin became a teacher, much like Bisclavret and Alphouns, while Greyback became bestial and, quite possibly, a man-eater, as happens with Lycaon and Petronius' soldier.

If we take the latter case first, we find similarities between Petronius' soldier-werewolf and the Lupin-Greyback hybrid figure. As with Petronius, Rowling's werewolves become potentially man-eating wolves and turn bestial in their wolf form—for example, Greyback manages to channel his violence only by positioning himself before he changes shape and Lupin is stripped of most, if not all, of his civility and control when he changes around humans. These werewolves are also, like Petronius', feared by the public and subject to monstrous reputations involving violence and cannibalism, though with the addition of a focused threat toward children. Presumably both werewolves lose their clothing when they change shape. However, this can only be proven with Petronius, as previously shown. Rowling remains quiet on this matter either: because she does not consider it an important point, because she minimizes discussion of clothing throughout the novels,[11] or because she is reticent to come close to anything

involving direct sexuality beyond basic dating.[12] Since we only see a werewolf change shape on-screen once (Lupin) and never see one revert back to human form, this particular point remains speculative. That said, given her use of previous traditions, the loss of clothing during the transformation seems likely, but Petronius' ritual in the graveyard is not present.

Likewise, the association of lycanthropy with divine displeasure is not present with Rowling as it is with Ovid. There are certain similarities between the two, though. Despite the lack of divine involvement, both Lupin and Greyback presumably did not know the change was coming and were taken by surprise. Like Lycaon, how they react tells the audience a great deal about their individual characters. Perhaps the most important similarity in this respect is that, like Lycaon, Greyback embraces his bestial form and that aspect of his nature. That is, he, like Lycaon, gives in to his shadow and gives free rein to the anti-social, bestial aspects of his psyche. He apparently adapted quickly, as Lycaon did, and discovered ways to use this otherwise undesired ability to his advantage. Greyback chooses, like Lycaon, to use this change to inspire fear in those around him. He revels in threatened violence, as shown when Lupin explains Greyback's tactics to Harry in *Half-Blood Prince* or the threats he levels both in that work and in *Deathly Hallows*, which will be discussed in greater detail concerning his early modern ancestors. On the other hand, Lupin rejects the animalism implicit in the new shape. He resists the urges Lycaon and Greyback gave in to, strives to master these urges, and is generally successful at doing so. He has come to terms with his shadow by his first appearance, and has learned to control that part of his psyche to some extent, partially

with the aid of James Potter and Sirius Black. Only once during the narrative does the audience see his control slip. Ironically, this occurs when he is surrounded by three recently come-of-age children, including his best friend's son: Harry. Whether he loses control off-screen, such as when he is attempting to bring the werewolf community away from Greyback, we cannot say for sure. The fact that he is described as being haggard, prematurely greying, and run-down every time Harry sees him during the two year/book period that he performs this work could argue for either a retention or loss of control. If the latter occurred, though, it is doubtful the audience would know since all of the audience's information comes from Harry and Lupin would hardly tell Harry, of all people, if he lost control.

Although these classical roots are present and important to note, Lupin has a much stronger tie to the medieval werewolf tradition. Marie de France's *Bisclavret* is a nearly perfect example of Lupin's ancestry in that there are many strong parallels between the characters. Initially both characters are the exception to the rule—that is, both authors first present entirely vicious and anti-heroic stereotypes of werewolves then introduce and focus on sympathetic examples for their readers. Marie transmits this information in a straightforward method at the outset. Rowling waits to some extent, although she subtly refers to the *garvulf* reputation that her werewolves are part of throughout the first two books. When Lupin appears in the third book, he is presented as a *bisclavret*, a tame, courtly werewolf. In both cases, no figure appears to physically support the negative stereotype—at least not for some time in Rowling's novels. Eventually, Greyback is introduced and certainly fits the *garvulf* stereotype, but he does

so long after Lupin, the positive image, is well established. This ancestry has already been noted by some scholars, such as Arden and Lorenz who state, "Werewolves that presage Professor Lupin appear in Marie's 'bisclavret' and also in the anonymous 'Melion.'"[13] Likewise, with one exception, Lupin transforms off-screen, out of the public eye, exactly as Bisclavret does. Both figures, as has been previously discussed with Bisclavret, act to civilize others around them through their own examples of courtly/socialized behavior. Inextricably tied to their courtly/social examples, both characters have befriended their king or social/military leader—Bisclavret's nameless king and, for Lupin, Dumbledore who could have been a political leader and is certainly a guerilla military leader from *Order of the Phoenix* through his own death.

Like Bisclavret, Lupin acts to evoke pathos due to his situation, just as the audience feels sympathetic toward his medieval predecessor. Like Harry, the reader feels indignation and anger at Lupin's resignation after his secret is revealed. In much the same way, Marie's audience is intended to feel Bisclavret's sense of betrayal when his wife traps him and remarries. Because Lupin reappears over a longer narrative, the evocation of pathos develops during his continued involvement in Harry's story. This sense increases as it reaches a false peak in *Half-Blood Prince* when he explains that he has been pretending to join the werewolf who bit him.[14] However, the true peak of Lupin's pathos comes in the final novel where he achieves Harry's dream of having a family, only to lose both his wife and his own life during the final climactic battle.[15]

Lupin's participation in this final battle, at least partially motivated by a sense of justice, connects him to *William of Palerne's* Alphouns. Both layered tales include

characters who seek justice for various acts. Alphouns serves this role first in saving the eponymous character from an unjust murder plot. The fact that the audience is never told what happens to the uncle who was plotting to kill William is unimportant to the story. After that rescue, the werewolf ensures that William is raised in a royal court, even if it is not that of his parents. Through his actions, he ensures that the injustice enacted upon himself by his stepmother is rectified so that both he and William are returned to their rightful places. Due to the actions of this werewolf, both unjust crimes are undone or foiled and two legitimate and just rulers are returned to their respective thrones. In this way, the proposed archetype appears again in order to reinforce old definitions and reify the social order through his brief transgression.

Similarly, Lupin acts as a force of just action in Harry's tale. Initially, he works to ensure that Harry is not unjustly and irreparably harmed by the dementors in the Hogwarts train. Later, he reminds Harry to behave judiciously toward Severus Snape because Snape is a known confidant of Dumbledore and did his part during the last war within the wizarding community, even though neither he nor Harry like the other professor. Of greater importance, though, is that Lupin helps Harry to see that justice is done in discovering Sirius Black's—his friend and Harry's godfather—innocence in the matter of Harry's parents. As part of this process, he works with Black to expose the actual perpetrator, Peter Pettigrew (another school friend of both men), and attempts to bring him to trial for his crime. Perhaps the most important aspect of the latter act is that Lupin causes Black to halt his attempt to kill Pettigrew himself. Although the act itself is of some importance, the motive has greater significance. The point at which Lupin

convinces Black comes when he states "you owe Harry the truth, Sirius!"[16] This statement finally recalls Black's sense of what is right and just to the point that, after explanations are done, his position shifts so he is convinced that only Harry has the right, as the injured party, to dispense justice in Pettigrew's case. Here we see the werewolf acting in its archetypal role to civilize others and police the standards of society. Black's vigilante justice is replaced by Harry's decision to work within society and let Pettigrew stand trial before a court.

The Black-Lupin-Pettigrew scene is a significant point of transition for the characters, the target readers,[17] and the series. Thus, it is an ideal moment at which to connect Rowling's modern werewolves to the medieval tradition. As previously noted, medieval werewolves appeared and regained popularity at moments of social, political, or religious transition. Thus Caroline Walker Bynum states that "We read [. . .] not in order to understand the tradition (an academic enterprise) but in order to understand [. . .] ourselves."[18] This is no less true for the modern audience reading about werewolves, in Rowling's case. Like the medieval archetypal werewolves, hers appear at a point of transition. As we should expect from Rowling, these transitions are multi-layered. The first time Rowling's werewolves appear in person is during *Prisoner of Azkaban,* in which Lupin is introduced. This particular part of the series contains many significant turning points. On a very basic level, *Azkaban* is the text that contains Harry's thirteenth birthday, a significant transition point for many British and American children, the beginning of their teenage years. The shift to Harry's teenage years, like most transitions, is a grey, mutable area in which he, his friends, and the target audience of the

narrative are moving between childhood and young adulthood. Into this stage of life, Rowling injects two of James and Lily Potter's best friends, one of whom happens to be a werewolf (and the other can willingly turn into a dog).[19] Both figures become mentors for the rest of Harry's early teenage years.

Although Harry's age is a significant transition point, it is not the only such point in *Prisoner of Azkaban*. The series undergoes a serious shift during the course of the narrative. My choice of the term "serious" to describe the change is done with purpose, and with no intent to present a pun on Black's name. While the series before *Azkaban* had its serious moments, for the most part it is lighthearted with everything returning to happy normalcy in the end. *Azkaban* signals a change in tone, in part caused by Lupin's lycanthropy. Lupin's uncontrolled change allows Pettigrew to escape in the end, leaving Black still accused of betraying the Potters and of being a mass murderer. For the first time, not everything works out for the heroes. Moreover, as Harry learns from Professor Trelawney, Pettigrew's escape, which Harry has to watch twice, eventually allows Voldemort to return to power. This threat signals an important shift in the tone of the series, which becomes progressively darker and begins to involve the demise of well-known characters like Black, Dumbledore, Lupin, Snape, and Moody.

The werewolves are temporarily silent during the fourth installment of the series. Lupin returns to greater prominence during the fifth (where another, unnamed, werewolf also appears), when the major conflict of the series begins in earnest. More important, in *Order of the Phoenix's* case, a significant transition occurs in which the first of Harry's father figures—Black—dies. This becomes doubly important in *Half-Blood Prince*,

calling for two werewolves (and a partial one) at to the death of Harry's other father figure (Dumbledore) and Voldemort's complete re-entry to the world. The final installment of the series, in which the threat is finally and utterly ended, includes not only the two full werewolves (Lupin and Greyback) and the partial werewolf (Bill Weasley) but also a half-werewolf (Lupin's and Tonk's son, Ted). As we can see, over the course of the last part of the series, the number of werewolves increases as the significance of the transition moments increase. In the end, though, all save the half-werewolf disappear: Lupin dies, Greyback vanishes, Bill Weasley fades from sight, but Ted Lupin remains in the epilogue.[20]

## Monstrosity, Mechanics, and Self-Fashioning

The werewolf changes as it moves into the early modern period, returning to its monstrous roots, as has already been demonstrated. While this change occurred, teratologists and demonologists became concerned with defining the process by which a werewolf changed forms. At the same time, broader European culture turned its interest toward the question of what defined an individual, thus forming an interest in the process of self-fashioning. Each of these points is important to the archetype in that shape-shifters are clearly monstrous and use that trait to enforce social rules, the mechanics and attempts at classification reveal a core mutability to the archetype that reflects the world,

and self-fashioning as a form of change and/or disguise is openly represented in the shape-shifter/werewolf. Rowling touches upon all three of these trends in her adaptation of the werewolf archetype. She ignores the English lycanthropy-as-madness tradition because it does not fit within the structure of the world she posits—people who simply believe they are werewolves would be as out of place in Rowling's fictional England as "real" werewolves would be in ours.

She deals with the monstrous tradition primarily through the early part of the series, before Lupin's arrival, and with Greyback, once Lupin has been established. Very early in Harry's and the readers' introduction to the fictional world, Harry and Draco Malfoy are sent to the Forbidden Forest for detention. On the way, Draco fearfully states "there's all sorts of things in there—werewolves, I heard,"[21] a threat with which Filch gladly plays along to heighten the students' fears. Later, this sentiment is echoed by Ron Weasley who asks, "aren't there supposed to be werewolves in the forest?"[22] in an attempt to avoid having to follow the spiders to Aragog. In both cases, werewolves are used to scare children into behaving, in much the same way as a bogeyman or a fairy tale witch might be employed. Through both early introductions, werewolves remain shadowy, an intellectual and emotional threat that the characters, protected as they are at school, are unlikely to ever actually encounter. These moments, however, act in much the same fashion as Marie de France's commentary regarding the *garvulf* in that they usher in Lupin, the tame werewolf.

Even so, that tame werewolf candidly admits that he once was, and can again be, monstrous: "Before the Wolfsbane Potion was discovered, however, I became a fully

fledged monster once a month."[23] There is little else directly tying the werewolf to monstrosity, though, until Lupin sets the stage for Greyback's arrival. During this prelude, Lupin tells Harry:

> [Greyback] regards it as his mission in life to bite and to contaminate as many people as possible; he wants to create enough werewolves to overcome the wizards. Voldemort has promised him prey in return for his services. Greyback specializes in children. . . . Bite them young, he says, and raise them away from their parents, raise them to hate normal wizards. Voldemort has threatened to unleash him upon people's sons and daughters.
>
> [. . .]
>
> At the full moon, he positions himself close to victims, ensuring that he is near enough to strike. He plans it all. And this is the man Voldemort is using to marshal the werewolves.[24]

Based on these tactics alone, Greyback is a clear reappearance of Continental early modern views of werewolves. He meets the criteria in that he changes shape, consorts with wizards and witches (not that this is unusual in Rowling's world), purposely attacks people, and specifically targets children. In fact, in a moment highly reminiscent of Jean Grenier, Greyback practically salivates, saying "Delicious girl . . . What a treat . . . I do enjoy the softness of the skin."[25] Grenier told the village girl, "he found [dogs'] flesh less palatable than the flesh of little girls, which he regarded as a supreme delicacy."[26] Placed next to each other, we cannot help but see the similarity of the language and sentiment. Thus, Greyback is in some respect an older Grenier, one who did not get caught early in

life, but managed to remain not only hidden but successful in his own fashion for at least a couple decades.[27] Although a sexualized interpretation could be argued here, a stronger position, based on the text, is that these scenes hint at cannibalism and directly display Voldemort's use of Greyback as an expendable terrorist who strikes at the most vulnerable part of society. This also is pertinent to his bestial nature in that it is a common practice of wolves and similar predators to target young prey as being easier to separate from the herd and catch.

This bestiality is referred to again several times in Greyback's case. The first key moment is when Greyback attacks Harry, who "fell backward, with filthy matted hair in his face, the stench of sweat and blood filling his nose and mouth, hot greedy breath at his throat."[28] Not content with merely biting victims, Greyback always attacks the throat and face, even when he is not transformed. This practice is demonstrated again when he attacks another student during the series' climax and when he attacks Bill Weasley in *Half-Blood Prince*, savaging Bill's face in the process. Harry later described Greyback as having "a face covered in matted grey hair and whiskers, with pointed brown teeth and sores at the corners of his mouth,"[29] adding a monstrous appearance to his monstrous behavior.[30] The lack of hygiene indicates Greyback's place in society, or rather outside it, in that he makes no attempts to take care of his appearance and has no access to any sort of health care. As can be seen from Lupin's descriptions of his time in wolf shape, many of Greyback's wounds are probably self-inflicted. While Lupin is often described as greying or shabby, his appearance is generally discussed as being pitiable or pathetic rather than monstrous. The other key moment, one that is connected to appearance,

occurs when Harry, faced with Greyback, thinks "Fenrir Greyback, the werewolf who was permitted to wear Death Eater robes in return for his hired savagery."[31] Yet, as Harry later adds, Greyback's savagery is not allowed to fully enter the society that Voldemort creates. Even the monstrous wizard has his limits. These limits are, of course, part and parcel of his general Hitlerian racial cleansing program; he is happy to harness Greyback's and his shadow's savagery, but neither Greyback nor his fellow werewolves will ever be part of the society they help create. This realization begins to transmute the savage werewolf into a pitiable figure, even if he never comes close to the state Lupin occupies.

Rowling's monsters, like their early modern counterparts, do follow certain rules. As with most of the modifications she made to create her world, Rowling manipulates the mechanics of their existence to meet her literary ends. This is a reappearance, as it is with Pratchett, of the early modern interest in the mechanics of shape-shifting and witchcraft. In some cases, these rules are laid out in a simple format, as is seen in the fictional book Rowling authored under the pseudonym Newt Scamander, *Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them*. The inclusion of werewolves in this book places them among non-human creatures, arguing for both monstrosity and a racial interpretation as will be discussed in more detail later. What is more important for the purposes of charting Rowling's early modern influences is that she lays out a few basic mechanics of the werewolf change in this format:

> Humans turn into werewolves only when bitten. There is no known cure, though recent developments in potion-making have to a great extent alleviated the worst

> symptoms. Once a month, at the full moon, the otherwise sane and normal wizard or Muggle afflicted transforms into a murderous beast. Almost uniquely among fantastic creatures, the werewolf actively seeks humans in preference to any other kind of prey.[32]

While the description answers some mechanical questions, it opens up other questions that will be dealt with later. As the appearances of the werewolves continue, other mechanical rules are revealed through both Harry's discussions with Lupin and physical demonstrations. Interestingly, Rowling presents apparent contradictions to the rules in some cases as well. An example occurs in *Chamber of Secrets* in which the vain Professor Lockhart claims that, while fighting a werewolf, he once "performed the immensely complex Homorphous Charm—[the werewolf] let out a piteous moan [. . .] The fur vanished—the fangs shrank—and he turned back into a man,"[33] implying that he cured this werewolf, though Rowling later emphatically states that there is no cure for lycanthropy. In this case, she uses the werewolf in an archetypal role as another means of undercutting the authority and self-image of the character through Lockhart's implied claim that he can break the rules that govern the world. Although there is room to argue that the "cure" is temporary, the only other time the charm might have been used in the series is when Black and Lupin force Pettigrew back into his human shape.[34] Moreover, everything else Lockhart claims is shown to be false, so the reader has no reason to trust this particular incident either.

There are other mechanics that Rowling refers to throughout the series, with most appearing in *Prisoner of Azkaban* and later works. Early in *Azkaban*, Rowling refers to

the early modern Continental image of werewolves again by having Hermione state that "the werewolf differs from the true wolf in several small ways,"[35] before she is interrupted. The details are later filled in during one of Snape's memories, which Harry manages to see in *Order of the Phoenix*. His father, Black, and Lupin are seen joking over a question about identifying werewolves on the Defense Against the Dark Arts exam[36] when Pettigrew brings up "the snout shape, the pupils of the eyes, and the tufted tail."[37] This example shows the reader that, unlike the cinematic version of *Azkaban*, Rowling intended the werewolves to possess a human and a wolf shape only, in the medieval and early modern traditions, without the hybrid wolf-man of twentieth-century film. It also demonstrates that her werewolves are not identical to real wolves, even if the clues are more subtle than many commonly expressed in early modern sources—including a short or missing tail—yet less subtle or subjective than the behavioral signs that were commonly cited—such as not acting like a wolf.

Most of the information the reader receives about the mechanical aspects of lycanthropy come from Lupin himself, who is like Sergeant Angua in that he is a self-reflective werewolf. He is the one who tells Harry that, "My parents tried everything, but in those days there was no cure"[38] and that the Wolfsbane Potion is both a recent discovery and not a cure. Interestingly, as was discussed in the sections on the classical and early modern periods, Rowling's transformed werewolves typically lose their access to rational thought. But, Lupin states, "As long as I take [the Wolfsbane Potion] in the week preceding the full moon, I keep my mind when I transform . . . I am able to curl up in my office, a harmless wolf, and wait for the moon to wane again."[39] With the potion,

he becomes a medieval sympathetic werewolf. Tied in with this statement is the idea that Rowling's werewolves cannot willingly change shape, unlike their early predecessors.

Throughout the extended narrative, Rowling presents several other insights into the mechanics and rules governing her werewolves. The aforementioned examples serve as a representative sample, save only for the important one that she never truly answers: can the affliction be passed on from parent to child?

The question arises first because of something Voldemort, as Tom Riddle, tells Harry in *Chamber of Secrets*, that Hagrid was "trying to raise werewolf cubs under his bed" when he was a student.[40] Riddle/Voldemort returns to the same question at the end of the series after Lupin marries Tonks. The audience's only authority on the subject, Lupin himself, appears convinced that the condition can be passed on, but does not truly know. The evidence of Ted Lupin seems to prove them both wrong, as do the repeated statements that only those bitten by werewolves acquire the traits, but since the initial information comes from an unreliable source and there is no later evidence, the question still exists and has some bearing on future interpretations of the phenomenon.

The fact that this particular question remains unanswered is important because of its effect on Lupin's brand of self-fashioning, which mimics the early modern concept. Throughout their appearances, both Lupin and Greyback act as representatives of self-definition, a key concept for self-fashioning. Greyback, to reverse their order, gives in to public opinion and his race/affliction. He strives to become the beast that others believe he ought to be as a werewolf. He descends into this concept so far that Harry at one point describes seeing "a grey blur that Harry took for an animal sped four-legged across the

hall to sink its teeth into one of the fallen,"[41] referring to Greyback, who is not transformed at the time (we know this, in part, because Lupin is not transformed). He accepts and fully embraces the bestial side that his society believes is his nature. Conversely, Lupin accepts the social view with regard to many of his fellow werewolves, but rejects it for himself. As Castiglione and Machiavelli recommend their readers do for social gain, Lupin refashions himself for social acceptance. In this way, he displays the potential threat involved in self-fashioning—the monster hiding in society by masquerading as human. He acquires an education, although later in his life he admits to being ashamed of putting other students in potential danger. Not only that, but he eventually becomes a teacher, if only briefly (what he teaches and to whom will be discussed in greater detail later). Throughout his time in the proverbial spotlight, he acts as a peacemaker and as a calm foundation for other characters, notably Black and James Potter. In fact, Lupin states that Dumbledore made him a prefect in his fifth year and says that the headmaster "might have hoped that I would be able to exercise some control over my best friends [. . .] I need scarcely say that I failed dismally."[42] Even though he failed, the important point is that he made an effort to move beyond his supposed nature and was recognized as a source of civility and socialization rather than a ravening monster.

The words Castiglione uses to describe Duke Guidebaldo apply equally well to Lupin:

> although he was a man of mature deliberation and unconquerable spirit, everything he set his hand to, whether in arms or anything else, great or small,

> always ended unhappily, as we can see from the many diverse calamities which befell him, and which he always bore with such fortitude that his will was never crushed by fate. On the contrary, with great resilience and spirit, he despised the blows of Fortune, living the life of a healthy and happy man, despite sickness and adversity, and achieving true dignity and universal renown.[43]

While not all of Lupin's endeavors end unhappily, he suffers more than the normal share of calamities. Moreover, he meets nearly all of the criteria that Castiglione sets out for a gentleman: skill at arms (shown in *Order of the Phoenix* and *Deathly Hallows*), loyalty (shown repeatedly), bravery, kindness, modesty, and learning. The only ones potentially missing are noble birth (he is a half-wizard, half-Muggle), music, and painting. Of equal importance is the fact that, like the Harry-Voldemort dynamic and Harry's various friends versus Voldemort's minions, Lupin and Greyback further illustrate Castiglione's statement that "(since evil is the opposite of good and good of evil) the one must always sustain and reinforce the other, and if the one diminishes or increases, the other, as its necessary counter-force, must do the same."[44] Once the good, sympathetic werewolf dies, his monstrous opposite vanishes from the series.

## Lupin, Greyback, and Archetype

The sense of balance, or counter-force, discussed by Castiglione and its presence in Rowling's werewolves connects them to a Jungian analysis with reference to the concept of the shadow. This concept represents the various personality traits that society desires to purge and is clearly present in both Lupin and Greyback, through their animalistic sides, moreso in Greyback's case since he gives himself entirely over to the bestial shadow. Lupin, on the other hand, acknowledges and accepts the shadow, but does not let it control his actions, thereby becoming a psychologically healthy individual in the Jungian sense. Both figures, through their interactions with the shadow, tie themselves to the shape-shifter archetype in several ways. The most obvious of these is that they are capable of changing form and thereby of crossing racial and species boundaries. This is only the most superficial connection, though.

When we consider how the two characters act and respond to their fictional environment, we can see that they fulfill many of the other qualities of the archetype. Both Lupin and Greyback, as with many shape-shifters, act as civilizing figures, as previously discussed. In this capacity, they share a strong symbolic connection with their lycanthropic predecessors. This connection to the past is one key method by which they fulfill the archetype's promise of stability within mutability, a solid core within the evolving, metamorphic situation. Like Bisclavret or Alphouns, Lupin instructs others in proper behavior. He is considerably more direct in this act, since his first appearance in

the narrative is as a teacher and he continues to play the part even after his time as a formal educator is over. Throughout the remainder of the series, he commonly takes on a professorial tone in his discussions with Harry. In this, he joins Ron and Hermione as a source of information about the wizarding world, but unlike Ron, at least, Lupin's information is presented in a factual or philosophic manner rather than as common knowledge or rumor. In contrast to Hermione's, Lupin's information also comes from living as a wizard for his whole life and personal experience rather than book knowledge. This provides a third option as a source, one that is neither entirely bookish nor entirely word of mouth. Based on this information and his role as an educator, Lupin manages to subtly and not so subtly guide Harry's moral choices whenever a troubling situation arises. A good example of this occurs when Harry asks about the dementors' soul-sucking kiss and seems convinced that Black deserves that punishment for his alleged crime. Lupin quietly asks if Harry truly believes that anyone deserves that sort of punishment, which causes Harry to reconsider.

Greyback, on the other hand, functions to maintain civility and socialization through fear. He becomes not only a tool that Voldemort uses against those who cross him, but also a sort of bogeyman in the wizarding community. The barely restrained violence inherent in his character serves to incite fear of transgression in Voldemort's ideal society, while creating a strong sense of repugnance in his opponents who realize that his actions threaten the fabric of society. Interestingly, even Voldemort himself will not cross the boundary that Greyback passed long before Harry was born. Throughout the series, the only times Voldemort directly attacks or kills another character (except for

Harry) that individual is an adult. Even Cedric Diggory, while still at school, was technically an adult. The only exceptions occur when Voldemort, too, was underage. Conversely, Greyback delights in attacking children, an act that excites him and about which he routinely salivates. In his role as shape-shifter, he frightens both other characters and the audience into a social mold that balks at harming the perceived innocents within society.[45] If the audience acquires this sense of fearing transgression in one aspect of what Greyback does, then they are likely to begin to translate that response to the socio-political entity that he represents and works for, thus enhancing their support for the socio-political entity that opposes his, the social norm. In this respect, the unrestrained werewolf functions as a representation of modern terrorists, working to create fear in service of his socio-political ideals.

Through Greyback's position as an agent of completely unrestrained transgression, juxtaposed against Voldemort's limited transgression, he serves an important function of the archetype. In this role, he commits acts of violence well beyond the norms accepted by society. But through his inherent violence, with its erotic undercurrent and threat of future transgressive violence, he creates a forbidden and vicarious release of the shadow, a place in the imagination where the shadow can act completely unfettered and do as it will.

The socially constructed norm also has a part to play in that Lupin and Greyback represent the archetype's approach to the nature-nurture debate. Through the process of self-fashioning, Lupin manages to master the bestial nature of the werewolf as far as he is able, for the civil, socially acceptable, and calm Lupin does slip away at least once,

during which point "he glared at them so fiercely that Harry saw, for the first time ever, the shadow of the wolf upon his human face."[46] The dominance of nurture over nature is a theme that Rowling returns to time and time again through Hagrid and Harry, especially through and after *Goblet of Fire*, both in the realm of genetics and that of fate/destiny. Harry also acts to point to nature ascendant thanks to his childhood taken in light of his time at Hogwarts. Likewise, we can argue that Lupin's pre-lycanthropy nature overshadows his post-lycanthropy nature, but following this line leads to no conclusive findings since any account of his early life is limited or non-existent. The nature dominant option in the aforementioned debate, however, is seen more clearly with Greyback. That werewolf, as noted previously, embraces the bestial side of his nature and uses it as a form of power to terrorize others. Like the early modern Continental werewolf accounts, he succumbs to the basic desires and violence said to be inherent to the form. Because of this reveling in the supposedly bestial, glorifying in his restrained cannibalistic urges (another sign of the shape-shifter archetype), he represents that which is most monstrous about the werewolf and the human—especially in using the rational human to guide the irrationally violent monster's actions. Tied to their unsettling of the nature-versus-nurture divide is the fact that these figures inherently attack socially imposed categories. The most obvious is that implied above in the fictional Scamander's classification—werewolves are clearly human, but they are discussed in a book about "fantastic beasts." By that very placement, they act to disrupt the categories, as do the centaurs and merfolk also mentioned in the book, but who are clearly sentient and human-like. Beyond that point, Lupin reminds Harry at least twice that the world is not

black and white in its morality, usually in reference to Snape—a point on which Black supports him in *Order of the Phoenix*, when he applied the concept to Dolores Umbridge.

Neither Lupin nor Greyback function entirely within the older models of werewolf behavior. While they certainly retain most of the aspects of the archetype, they also expand it. The archetype's manifestation has to expand and metamorphose in this case because society and individuals have evolved, and collapsed, several times since the early werewolf films, and even more since the seventeenth century. As such, the evolution of the archetype into Rowling's representations is a new beginning, another re-birth that the figure undergoes periodically in order to maintain its fluidity, hybridity, and relevance. This expansion occurs not necessarily through the addition of more layers or traits, but through the application of those traits. The role Lupin and Greyback play in discussions of intolerance and racism are clearly an aspect of the shape-shifter archetype's dissolution of artificially constructed boundaries, but they represent a new method of applying that aspect that is not present in the literary werewolf before the modern era. Their use in the discussion of morality and paradox is equally familiar as a form of the boundary aspect, but again is employed using different techniques. To date, Remus Lupin is the first literary werewolf imagined in the role of a school teacher, while he is not the only one, there are very few other examples.[47] Although his literary ancestors taught lessons, none of them did so in a classroom setting or with the professor-student relationship as such. This particular role also affects his use in instructing others about civility, social compliance, and respect. It is his own nature, or nurtured

upbringing, that informs his role as a peacemaker and the discussion of friendship in which he becomes involved.

Like most monsters, Lupin and Greyback are also part of an inversion of the classic hero tale such as those analyzed by Joseph Campbell. According to Crystal L. O'Leary, this inversion begins in that "the monster is born into separation through the father's unnatural act of procreation,"[48] in this case Greyback's biting Lupin to make him a werewolf. Another shift occurs because "the first stage of the monster's journey [is] separation from the human community due to form [and the] second stage of the quest [is] discovery of self in relation to the outer world."[49] In this case, the separation involves Lupin's removal to Hogwarts and the Shrieking Shack as a double separation from the human community, one that he returns from only with the assistance of his friends– Black, Pettigrew, and James Potter. Through this separation, and his later separation into the community of his fellow werewolves, he acquires a greater understanding of the human community, which he endeavors to impart to Harry on several occasions.

## Wolves in Education

Monsters, in general and by their very nature, act as educators. Through them, according to Asa Mittman, the "audience is invited to adopt temporarily the perspective

of people more marginal than themselves."[50] This is doubly true of the werewolves in Rowling's work. Initially these representatives of the shadow are marginalized as part of a special sub-community and world, that of the wizards and witches. Even in that already marginal community, they are further marginalized and pushed to the fringes by both popular fears and legal statutes. The latter is directly seen when Black speaks of Umbridge, saying "she drafted a bit of anti-werewolf legislation two years ago that makes it almost impossible for [Lupin] to get a job."[51] Because of such treatment, the werewolves "have shunned normal society and live on the margins, stealing—and sometimes killing—to eat."[52] Already, the reader begins to learn from these figures, thanks to the self-fulfilling prophecy inherent in these two statements—because of fear that this community will be violent, it is legally marginalized, this in turn causes it to become violent in order to survive.

In Rowling's work, the werewolves—Lupin, Greyback, the unnamed one, and the partial werewolves—all serve to educate key characters, especially Harry, Ron, and Hermione, as well as the audience about a variety of subjects. On one level, the werewolves speak to intolerance, prejudice and racism. This particular lesson becomes more overt, as will be shown, through Hermione, Ron, and Lupin. The werewolves are only a facet of Rowling's discussion of that issue, but one that is commonly overlooked or dismissed.[53] Connected to this discussion is the use of werewolves to talk about incurable diseases, including HIV/AIDS, some forms of cancer, or multiple sclerosis. The difference between these two issues or lessons is a thin line that Rowling continuously crosses over. Due to Lupin's position, both as a teacher and a friend of

Harry's parents, the werewolves, true to the archetype, also present lessons about morality and present apparent moral paradoxes. The latter, Lupin and Black join to explain, are generally discussed through a moral continuum rather than binaries, a fact that has annoyed certain elements of society, as evidenced by the number of attempts to ban the books on moral grounds. Lessons on morality, at least those coming from Lupin, are inextricably tied to questions of friendship and respect that are of great importance to Rowling and the younger range of her target audience, though they can be a useful reminder for her older audience members as well. The professorial or educator werewolf also functions to educate the characters and audience in civility and socialization. In the former case, Lupin works as a peacemaker and civilizing force. Developing socialization, both Lupin and Greyback work together to both socialize certain characters and to complicate the idea of producing socially normal children or young adults.

Monstrosity in all its forms, across every century, has been tied to questions of racial and/or ethnic identity. As Andriano says, "the myth of the beast-monster involves the question–indeed the very definition–of race,"[54] in that many of the monstrous races imagined from the earliest days of storytelling stand in for foreign otherness. Thus, Rowling's house-elves which can be interpreted as pre-abolition African slaves (in the U.S. or Britain) and her goblins can easily be read as standing in for pre-Holocaust stereotypes of Jewish moneylenders.

This is no less true with the case of Rowling's werewolves. Initially, Rowling treats these figures as possibly sentient beings, but not necessarily so. They are discussed as "things" and the students are set to copy "different ways of treating werewolf bites"[55]

in class. But they appear to have some capacity for rational thought, thanks to an early reference to the "1637 Werewolf Code of Conduct."[56] Even when Lupin is first introduced, the question of sentience is unresolved, in part by Snape's assigning "an essay [. . .] on the ways you recognize and kill werewolves."[57] This seemingly innocuous assignment, given that Lupin taught the class about dealing with various "Dark" creatures, takes on a very different tone when the characters and readers discover that Lupin is a werewolf.

The reader quickly becomes aware that Snape's professed view of werewolves is not unique. Interestingly, the evidence comes not from his Slytherins, whom the reader comes to expect as his support, but from Ron and Hermione. While Draco responds to Lupin with "Look at the state of his robes [. . .] He dresses like our old house elf,"[58] in a statement typical of Malfoy, he is focused on socio-economic class.[59] As Elaine Ostry notes, it is Ron who acts as "the mouthpiece of common prejudices"[60] and shrinks back from Lupin, a teacher he previously respected. Ron is the one who spits out "Dumbledore hired you when he knew you were a werewolf? . . . Is he mad?"[61] This move, switching the roles the reader assumes for her protagonists and antagonists, is characteristic of Rowling's writing, and is rather subtle in this case. The reader's eye easily skims over this passage and accepts it, in part, I think, because Ron and Hermione are Harry's (and the reader's) primary sources of information about, and interpretation of, the wizarding world. Since the two of them react strongly, Ron characteristically moreso than Hermione,[62] and they have been trustworthy throughout the series, the reader is led to accept their reactions. Here, the shape-shifter appears in order to cross the boundaries

between characters and parts of society in that the otherwise good, positive characters display less positive qualities. The werewolf temporarily withdraws the self-fashioned façade of binary thought to display the grey areas it conceals. Snape, like Draco, remains true to form in his relations with Lupin. As readers tend to do with all of Snape's reactions, we wonder where exactly he falls. Initially, Lupin appears correct in asserting that Snape is holding on to an old childhood grudge. This, of course, paints the Potions Professor as a petty individual. However, Snape later states: "He [Dumbledore] was quite convinced you were harmless, you know, Lupin . . . a *tame* werewolf"[63] and "Don't ask me to fathom the way a werewolf's mind works."[64] These two brief statements recall Ron's socialized or nurtured racism, which serves to increase the reader's already confused perspective on Snape and his motives. Lupin appears resigned to this sort of intolerance as he tells Harry, "This time tomorrow, the owls will start arriving from parents . . . They will not want a werewolf teaching their children."[65] To interpret this particular statement accurately, we have to consider both the idea of lycanthropy as a disease that Lupin could easily pass on to any number of children and the terror created by the actions of Greyback and his followers. Since Rowling has established that Greyback targets children as a form of terrorism, and encourages his followers to do the same, the parents of Hogwarts students are likely to think that any werewolf must be the same.

The theme continues throughout the series, with prejudice and intolerance generally using the language of racism. Talking about Hagrid's revelation that he is a half-giant, Hermione says, "It's the same sort of prejudice that people have toward

werewolves. . . . It's just bigotry, isn't it?"[66] Hermione and Kreacher both place the issue firmly within the realm of racism as well. She states "it's the same kind of nonsense as werewolf segregation, isn't it? It all stems from this horrible thing wizards have of thinking they're superior to other creatures."[67] This, of course, reveals its own racial superiority complex inherent in the use of the term "creatures" instead of "races" or some other less pejorative or bestial terminology. But, the sentiment is most important, since it links the anti-werewolf prejudice in Rowling's world to racism. Likewise, Kreacher's statement about "Mudbloods and werewolves"[68] is of the same order in a society where a lack of pure blood is considered by some to be of a different race. Karin Westman has noted from similar statements "that [Ron's] prejudice against werewolves is not isolated but of a piece with other cultural fears against non-wizard species."[69] As if to add subtle insult to injury, we discover in book five that this prejudice came to Ron through another likeable character: his mother. Upon learning that a werewolf is sharing a ward with her injured husband, she asks, "A werewolf? [. . .] Is he safe in a public ward? Shouldn't he be in a private room?"[70] And her concern comes after years of knowing Lupin, the clearest exception to the prejudicial rule, and at a time far removed from a full moon (since she does not harbor the same fears regarding Lupin at that time).

The source of this prejudiced view, and its racial connotations, is nowhere more evident than in the words of Dolores Umbridge, who tells a class of students that they have been taught by "extremely dangerous half-breeds,"[71] meaning Lupin. The clearest explanation is offered by Black when Hermione asks about Umbridge's racism. He simply states, "Scared of them, I expect [. . .] Apparently she loathes part-humans."[72]

This fear is understandable, to some extent, in the representatives of government. Historically, governments have done their best to "protect" their societies from perceived outsiders, whether these outsiders are Jewish sub-communities, gypsy wanderers, Viking raiders, Irish laborers, or African ex-slaves looking to make a living. The fact that Rowling's werewolves, half-giants, and half-Veela, at least, can blend in with the general populace only makes them a greater threat to the social order because they do not stand out, or at least the werewolves do not most of the time.[73] According to Rowling, and presumably most readers, the fact that the prejudice is understandable does not excuse it. Rather, being understandable only makes it worse because it becomes insidious: the same heroic characters who take a stand against Voldemort and his Hitlerian program against non-pure bloods generally have no problems with the treatment of werewolves and other part-humans. Of the two, this makes Umbridge a much more fearsome and, in some ways, realistic villain than Voldemort could ever hope to be.

As with nearly everything in Rowling's world and involving the proposed archetype, characterizing Lupin's lycanthropy as a race issue is an oversimplification. On the surface, the aforementioned statements by Ron Weasley, Snape, and Umbridge combine with European tradition and common pop cultural thought to create a seemingly clear cut discussion of racism inherent in Rowling's wizarding community. Ostry and Westman point directly to the racism interpretation, stating: "Rowling protests racial intolerance by showing how such creatures as giants [. . .] werewolves, and elves are treated"[74] and "The tensions [. . .] among werewolves [. . .] and wizards echo the fervent tensions between race and class in the 'real' contemporary British politic"[75] respectively.

From this perspective, Rowling certainly voices her position against racial intolerance, through the evolving views and general reactions of Harry, Ron, Hermione, Dumbledore, Black, and the Weasleys in their relationships with Lupin. This reading of the character also ties in with issues of socialization.

That said, Rowling's language is far from clear when she brings up the lycanthropy-as-race issue. When Lupin describes his origins—"I was a very small boy when I received the bite. My parents tried everything, but in those days there was no cure. The potion that Professor Snape has been making for me is a very recent discovery"[76]—he uses the language of illness and disease. Lupin was not born a werewolf. In fact, it appears that none of Rowling's werewolves were born that way.[77] Because of transmission through a bite and the fact that, to quote Katherine Grimes and Lana Whited, "Lupin can be treated but not cured,"[78] the reader is left wondering whether lycanthropy is a sort of retrovirus affecting the genetic code or a disease like HIV/AIDS, as a handful of critics have suggested, or cancer or MS. Among such critics is Westman, who theorized that "Lupin's status as werewolf [. . .] could represent contemporary prejudice against homosexuals or those infected with HIV."[79] Giselle Anatol likewise considers with the question of race or disease, making the same suggestion of equating lycanthropy with HIV/AIDS.[80]

Rowling herself seems unclear as to whether her lycanthropes are a race or a group of diseased individuals. We should expect this sort of ambivalence regarding categories in reference to the archetype that implicitly resists categorization. At some points she uses the language of racism, as previously noted, and at others she shifts into

the language of disease—other children being "exposed" to Lupin, a potion/medication that causes his problem to go into temporary remission, discussions of curing lycanthropy, or Lupin's own statement that "Tonks deserves somebody young and whole"[81] implying that he is not well. At a presentation in 2003, Rowling stated that Lupin was afflicted with a "contagious disease,"[82] but this only works with some of the language she employs when discussing his character, so we can only accept it to a limited extent. In *Order of the Phoenix*, Rowling primarily uses the language of race relations with Lupin, specifically in references to his social life, Hermione's S.P.E.W., and Umbridge's comments, as we have noted. But, in *Half-Blood Prince*, the language changes to that of disease, largely in discussing Greyback, the Wolfsbane Potion, and Bill Weasley's bite.[83] *Deathly Hallows* returns to racial language, which comes in large part from Voldemort. If lycanthropy is purely a racial issue, one would not expect the Wolfsbane Potion to exist since there is no medication that can, even temporarily, change a person's race. Likewise, if it is purely a disease, then the reader could expect to see more werewolves in St. Mungo's Hospital, if only for research purposes, especially once Greyback and his followers are set loose upon society.

This ambiguity is typical for Rowling's characters, especially Lupin, and translates itself into the realm of morality as well. Both Lupin and Greyback function to instill morality in both other characters and the audience. In Lupin's case, the morality also carries over into his own actions, since he stands as an example of positive morals. Greyback enforces social morality, on the other hand, through providing a negative example intended to cause fear of transgression as previously discussed. Of the two,

Lupin's positive reinforcement is clearly the more effective thanks in large part to his appearances and positive relationship with the protagonists throughout the series. Lupin's role as an agent of morality is somewhat paradoxical because, as Grimes and Whited note, "as a werewolf, he would be generally perceived as an inappropriate role model"[84] while such characters as Snape and Umbridge are held up as appropriate role models by the same characters, such as Cornelius Fudge and Lucius Malfoy. This is only one potential paradox in his character that is tied to morality.

Lupin fulfills the archetype's role as a moral guide in several ways. The most subtle is during the scenes in which he shares the stage with boggarts: twice in *Prisoner of Azkaban* and once in *Order of the Phoenix*. In all three cases, the boggart, a being that turns into that which the viewer most fears, becomes "a silvery orb hanging in the air in front of Lupin."[85] Just as Harry's dementor-boggart is interpreted, by Lupin, as representing a fear of fear, Lupin's has a subtext beneath the obvious fear of the full moon. Since the transformation becomes less painful with the potion, what the full moon represents for Lupin is the loss of control, the loss of social acceptance, and through that, the possibility of inadvertently harming others, including his friends and their families. This, in turn, suggests that what Lupin most fears is amorality and, if we define morality as a social construct, antisocial behavior. If that is the case, then Lupin's attempts to keep his temper and the tempers of others under control make sense as a moral action. His attempts focus on discipline, which Ellen Goldner notes, "appropriates the conspicuous body, redefining it as hideous; it makes of that body a mere (pre)text for the

painful production of the private soul,"[86] in the case of monstrous beings. Lupin's private soul then becomes the rock of morality with which he works to guide others.

The other, early, key moment in which Lupin establishes himself as a moral guide comes when he and Harry discuss dementors. After Lupin explains that these creatures essentially suck out their victims' souls, Harry quickly states that Black would then be getting what he deserved for betraying the Potters. To this, Lupin simply asks, "Do you really think anyone deserves that?"[87] The question causes Harry to go back and rethink what he knows and what he agreed to. In the process, his mind is changed as he moves toward a more morally positive path, incidentally closer to that which Dumbledore would advise as well. Lupin's place in this role can turn counterproductive, as he later worries, "My kind don't usually breed! It will be like me, I am convinced of it—how can I forgive myself, when I knowingly risked passing on my own condition to an innocent child."[88] Fortunately, Harry has been an apt student of the moral subtext and Lupin's own relationships. He turns the student-teacher dynamic around, making himself the instructor as he deftly turns Lupin's "immoral" act into one that is less immoral than abandoning his wife and unborn child. The scene not only shows that Harry has grown emotionally, but also that he has learned the moral lessons that Lupin and others have subtly taught him, to the point that he can act as a moral guide for them.

Lupin is a problematic moral guide because some of the morals he espouses are not socially positive. Whereas Perrault's Wolf pushes readers toward following rules and maintaining social structures, Lupin advocates violating rules and social restrictions on several occasions. He certainly displays this moral attitude during his time as a student,

roaming the school grounds with James and Black while he is dangerously transformed. Not only does this frequently repeated act violate myriad rules, but it also shows a clear disregard for potential consequences that Lupin only recalls after the fact. In spite of finally understanding the possible consequences, he does not learn from this experience, or is eventually convinced to ignore the lesson, as he breaks social conventions during adulthood to marry and have a child. Only later does he fully realize or consider the possible consequences, once it is too late to change anything. This particular disregard for rules, social convention, and consequences is something he implicitly encourages in Harry until the scene noted above in which Harry reverses their positions. This is one of the more subtle morals conveyed both by Lupin and the series: that sometimes, perhaps often, disregarding rules, society, and consequences is a necessity for individual and social development. This requirement seems clear because it is only by breaking the rules and conventions that Lupin can self-fashion and improve his station, and thereby achieve the dream of having a family in which Harry vicariously participates.

The other paradox that arises is the role of the "inherently" violent social outsider as moral guide. Lupin brings this problem to the forefront when he tells Harry "I'm not a very popular dinner guest with most of the community. [. . .] It's an occupational hazard of being a werewolf."[89] He is simultaneously a positive and destructive force. Roni Natov addresses this potential issue when she states, "Lupin, who is a werewolf, turns out to be a paradoxical figure: a force of good that can be dangerous as well."[90] The question we have to ask is: is this necessarily a paradox? After all, Dumbledore is both a force of good and rather dangerous (the latter is well known to both Cornelius Fudge and

Voldemort). As C. S. Lewis' Mr. Beaver said of Aslan, "Course he isn't safe. But he's good."[91] Being both good (civilized, human?) and dangerous (uncivilized, bestial?) is not necessarily a paradox. Rather, as shown through the medieval and early modern werewolf discussions, it is a key component of human nature and one that the shape-shifter archetype is especially apt at displaying. In Lupin's case, this supposed paradox turns into a boon, since he can use his split nature to spy on Voldemort's allies and attempt to convince other werewolves to support the status quo. In like fashion, Rowling employs this dual nature in such a way that she, in Natov's words, "establishes his innocence and evokes compassion for him" while "the potentially destructive part of the werewolf is humanized and offered with understanding."[92] In this way, the audience subconsciously adopts the underlying morality, positive and potentially negative, inherent in the character.

Lacking humanity to temper him, Greyback is dangerous and harkens back to Perrault's wolf. He represents the unbridled violence and anti-social aspects of the archetype. Because he is presented without redeeming qualities, Greyback is the shape-shifter archetype's representation of the consuming shadow. He espouses violence as the solution to problems, as evidenced by his attempted program to rebel against society. He also stands for a moral code that supports vengeance, terror, and transgressively cannibalistic (and metaphorically sexual) acts. This is clearest in his desire to attack and bite children (the younger, the better) not only in order to indoctrinate them into his own army, but because he has developed a taste for them, especially young girls, as previously discussed. The fact that Greyback apparently survives the series and Lupin does not

creates a problematic point. The positive, *bisclavret*, aspect of the archetype—the one that taught the use of reason to master the bestial shadow thus making the civilized stronger—dies, but not at the hands of his opposite (his death occurs off-screen, but seems to be wand-related). The negative, *garwulf*, aspect, the part that teaches violence, transgression, and consumption by the shadow, survives but vanishes from sight. Rowling's sympathetic werewolf does not survive while Perrault's wolf does. In this case, based on Harry's actions, Lupin's demise and Greyback's banishment show that Harry has learned his lesson and made his choice. He has internalized the lessons Lupin taught and thus no longer needs that part of the archetype's guidance, and he has rejected the Greyback aspect, thus banishing it back into the marginal space at the fringes of the psyche and society. In spite of this marginalization, the fact that Greyback presumably survives while Lupin does not implies that Perrault's wolf—the one that threatens punishment for transgression—is dominant. However, Lupin's instruction method is more effective in that his sacrifices are a core element of the lessons he is meant to teach, ones that Greyback as the negative aspects of the archetype would not understand.

Tied to Lupin's role as a moral guide are the lessons about friendship and respect that he quietly teaches alongside his many other lessons. Throughout his appearances in the series, Lupin serves to advance the faith in friendships that Rowling returns to repeatedly. We are told that Lupin took great pains to hide his condition so as not to lose his friendship with Black and James Potter, as he says, "I was terrified they would desert me the moment they found out what I was."[93] Later, he takes pains and makes excuses—

"I've been feeling a bit off color [. . .] this potion is the only thing that helps"[94]—to maintain his friendly mentoring relationship with Harry. Both attempts are undertaken to avoid the fate that met Bisclavret and other earlier werewolves: the loss of their standing, place, and relationships. However, in Lupin's case, the revelation of his condition, which James refers to as Lupin's "furry little problem,"[95] actually strengthens his friendship with the two troublemakers. In order to help him, both Black and Potter undertake a dangerous enchantment, which also happens to be illegal since they were not registered. He states that "Under their influence, I became less dangerous. My body was still wolfish, but my mind seemed to become less so while I was with them [. . .] Sirius and James transformed into such large animals, they were able to keep a werewolf in check."[96] For Harry, the situation is more complex due to his assumptions about Black, but he does come around. Because of the earlier friendship, Harry's and Lupin's is strengthened after the lycanthropy has been revealed to the point that Harry unconsciously echoes his father, saying "But you are normal! [. . .] You've just got a—a problem."[97] The reciprocal nature of this relationship comes to light at Harry's seventeenth birthday, after Lupin and Tonks leave. When they next meet him, Tonks explains, "The Ministry's being very anti-werewolf at the moment and we thought our presence might not do you any favors."[98] Rowling employs Tonks to represent as another layer, a fourth perhaps, of her focus on the importance of community, family, and friends.[99]

The question of friendship is inextricably tied to respect in Rowling's work. None of the characters for whom Harry lacks respect—Professors Lockhart, Slughorn

and Snape,[100] for example—ever come particularly close to him. This becomes especially important with Lupin as part of the archetype's role in building and supporting communities and societies. As Terri Doughty notes, from almost the first moment the audience and Harry meet Lupin, "even before he meets Sirius, Harry often seeks reassurance from Remus Lupin."[101] He knows Lupin, initially, as an authority figure thanks to the werewolf's luggage and presence on the Hogwarts Express. More importantly, his respect for Lupin as such a figure begins when the professor chases off a dementor and it grows even more when it becomes clear that Draco Malfoy disapproves of the werewolf. Harry's respect for his mentor reaches its climax at a major turning point, just after Dumbledore's death. After hearing the news, Lupin breaks down, leaving Harry to think that he "had never seen Lupin lose control before,"[102] something that only happens one other time during the series, when the werewolf feels that he has endangered his nascent family. This breakdown becomes important as it shows Harry that three of his mentors—Black, Dumbledore, and Lupin—are in fact merely human.

This respect spreads to others throughout Harry's third year of school so that by the time Lupin resigns, Harry "wasn't the only one who was sorry to see Professor Lupin go. The whole of Harry's Defense Against the Dark Arts class was miserable about his resignation,"[103] even knowing he was a werewolf. Indeed, at least one quips a hope that their next teacher will be a vampire, clearly showing that he does not mind the "monstrosity" of their ex-teacher. Along with this, as Chantel Lavoie contends, Lupin acquires respect from his friends because his "affliction is seen very much as a handicap, difficult to overcome. It requires a special sort of courage—one in which he must hurt

himself to protect others."[104] The others recognize this characteristic and respond to it, pushing themselves to match the courage they respect in him. In this way, Lupin shows that nurture can overcome nature and that this allows for a better, more psychologically complete individual. The other characters come to learn that he is a better person because he demonstrates an identity that lacks rigid, limiting boundaries and is therefore healthier psychologically. The others see this, respect it, and therefore attempt to achieve a similar state. This is especially important for Harry, as the repository of one-eighth of Voldemort's soul, which manifests itself in shadow-like ways that disturb Harry throughout the series. Harry sees the physical strain caused by this particular trait when Lupin comes to help smuggle him away from the Dursleys: "Remus Lupin, who was looking gaunt and grim, his brown hair streaked liberally with grey, his clothes more ragged and patched than ever."[105] This state comes about because of Lupin's work attempting to infiltrate and convince the werewolves around Greyback to rejoin society, in which he again deprives himself in order to help others and work against Greyback.

Lupin's lessons about respect are not limited to acquiring it for himself. He also demonstrates a great deal about respecting others—lessons Harry eventually understands. One sign of this aspect of his lessons comes in St. Mungo's when he "strolled away from [Arthur Weasley's] bed and over to the werewolf, who had no visitors"[106] on Christmas Day. Not only does this display a courteous respect for the Weasley family, but also a concerned respect for someone else who suffers from the same "furry little problem" he does. The majority of Lupin's lessons for Harry in this regard, though, focus on Dumbledore and Snape or Harry. He notes that his respect for Dumbledore comes from

the latter's belief in giving everyone a chance. Dumbledore, after all, arranged things so Lupin could come to the school. Lupin later states that Dumbledore "gave me a job when I have been shunned all my adult life, unable to find paid work because of what I am."[107] He also reminds Harry that both of them respect Dumbledore, who trusts Snape, therefore not giving Snape at least a chance to be trusted calls that respect in question. Moreover, he states that while he does not like Snape, he respects the man because he "made the Wolfsbane Potion for me every month, made it perfectly, so I did not have to suffer as I usually do at the full moon."[108] While this particular lesson is not absorbed by Harry until near the end of the whole series, it does eventually have its intended effect, once Harry learns why Dumbledore trusted Snape.

There is also a reversal in the relationship between Lupin and Harry. In that situation, in which Lupin makes what he thinks is a moral case for abandoning his family, he learns to respect Harry's judgement as well. Not only that, but he indirectly apologizes to Harry for not having that respect: "I'd tell him to follow his instincts, which are good and nearly always right."[109] Once again, the werewolf archetype appears at a turning point, a place of transition. Here the audience sees a moment when the core trio are reunited and the heroic quest is rejuvenated, both by Ron's return and by the exiled trio being able to listen to a radio program produced by some of their friends and relatives.

Throughout the series, Lupin provides this sort of support to every character he meets, both in aiding his friends and comrades or those he has just met. Part of the support he provides comes in the form of acting as the peacemaker and instructor in

civility and correct social behavior. The latter role is clear both from his position as a moral guide and from the fact that he spends most of his time as a teacher, whether in a classroom setting or elsewhere. In situations that threaten to get out of hand or reach a violent level, this werewolf through his own level of self-control, steps in to defuse the situation before it escalates too far. One of the clearest examples of this occurs when Harry's wish for information initiates an emotionally explosive scene between Mrs. Weasley and Black. Before the situation completely devolves, and while the other characters simply watch, Lupin raises his voice to sharply state, "Molly, you're not the only person at this table who cares about Harry [. . .] Sirius, sit *down* [. . .] I think Harry ought to be allowed a say in this [. . .] He's old enough to decide for himself."[110] Brought back to at least a grudging peace by their ordinarily quiet and calm companion, the others settle down. This role, in part, continues from his place as the civilizing force, much like Bisclavret and others among his predecessors. Another part of his peacemaking role comes from being an educator. Further aspects that certainly inform his pacific place include the self-control he requires to keep from devolving, himself, into a character like Greyback. In this case, the two aspects of the archetype work together as a reminder that a lapse of control and character could easily turn the educator-moral guide into the slavering beast. Greyback, once he finally appears, becomes Lupin's antithesis and that which Lupin could easily become.

That said, Lupin is fallible, a fact of which he is very aware. In the past, when he may have been meant to pacify and civilize certain characters, he failed, though he does not appear too upset about this specific failure. As he tells Harry, after the latter is told

his father was not a prefect but Lupin was, Dumbledore "might have hoped that I would be able to exercise some control over my best friends [. . .] I need scarcely say that I failed dismally."[111] The irony of the werewolf, the perceived poor role model, receiving the position of authority and rule enforcement is quietly ignored during this scene. An even more subtle statement is made in this act since it is neither Black nor James Potter, the pure-blood wizards, who receive this honor, but rather the half-blood and, in fact, "half-breed" (to use Umbridge's term) character. Dumbledore's actions in this presentation work to nudge Lupin further into the realm of socializing other characters, and the audience, by enacting some social construction or modification.

Lupin's role as a socializer and a questioner of socialization is intertwined with his complication of other characters. On the most superficial level, Lupin clearly acts as a socializing force in his position as a teacher, as noted previously. Not only that, but he is a popular teacher whose job is to train his students to defend themselves. On a slightly deeper level, though, Lupin, Giselle Anatol argues, "serves as a racialized Other; he has been 'passing' for human at Hogwarts in order to achieve acceptance."[112] In this position as Other, Lupin works to question socialization and complicate the readers' interpretation of other characters—specifically Draco Malfoy, Snape, and Ron. For example, before his secret is revealed, "no one else [except Draco] cared that Professor Lupin's robes were patched and frayed."[113] Even after the revelation, the reader is told that the entire third year Defense Against the Dark Arts class at the very least, with the possible exception of the Slytherin students, were sorry to see him leave. Through his example, many of the students renounced a common social prejudice. The notable exceptions to this

breakthrough are the aforementioned characters. Interestingly, Draco Malfoy comes off on good terms in this respect. The only criticism Malfoy has regarding Lupin is the previously mentioned predictable commentary on his appearance: "Look at the state of his robes [. . .] He dresses like our old house elf."[114] It is Ron and Snape who act as the voices of racial prejudice as has already been discussed. Lupin's role as a moral guide and peacemaker adds to the socialization effect as does the fact that he never really stops being a teacher, even after he loses his job at Hogwarts, and his tone with Harry remains partially mentoring and partially didactic.

This relation of Rowling's work to morality, or moral guides, has been noted by other scholars, as seen above. However, it is an important part of her use of werewolves, which is an aspect of the moral character that other scholars have marginalized in order to focus on Harry, his two closest friends, and perhaps one or two other characters (usually the adult Weasleys or Snape). Moreover, Rowling's use of the werewolf in this role as moral guide speaks to bridging the past and present in that medieval werewolves were put to similar use, though not as obviously and directly as Lupin.

## Into the Future

As with Pratchett's, Rowling's werewolves discover new possibilities for uses of the shape-shifter archetype and werewolf. In some cases, these uses are new applications of older themes, adapted to remain relevant and important. The fantastic genres as a whole, and Rowling in particular, not only present updated themes and stories from the past, they move beyond those foundations into unexplored territory, or transformed versions of familiar territory. In this respect, they ask the audience to question and/or redefine its views and definitions of the world. Rowling's use of the archetype is especially well adapted to this requirement on several levels, from socialization to definitions of race. At the same time, the werewolves provide a link to the past through the various traditions of ancestors from which both Lupin and Greyback are spawned. Not only does this appearance display the archetype's maintenance of stability within mutability, but through the questions they raise and the links they create, both werewolves are truly monstrous in the oldest sense (*monstrum*) in that they both show and reveal various things about ourselves and our world. In the Lupin and Greyback characters, Rowling compares medieval and classical-early modern Continental traditions of the werewolf while demonstrating the thin line between civil humanity and wild bestiality in one of her signature dualities. On the one side, a quiet, civilized, "tame" Lupin, on the other the savage, ravening Greyback, in between a distorting funhouse mirror that shows what each could have become. At the same time, she taps the

collective unconscious to retrieve two aspects of an important archetype that she allows to vanish once its work in the series is done.

Rowling moves beyond these roots to present her werewolves as signs of and lessons about issues important to both her target audience and older readers. There are factors, such as disease, friendship, and the socialization inherent in education, that are absent in the earlier sources, either because they were not important in the same way or did not exist on the scale they do today. Through these issues, Rowling moves the sympathetic werewolf into another aspect of the twenty-first century and approaches an audience younger than Pratchett's. This presentation to a younger audience moves the werewolf and shape-shifter into the future and acts to influence the views of these generations, in many cases before they are exposed to the non-sympathetic renditions that came out of the early and mid-twentieth century or the parodic-slapstick and/or erotic versions found in the 1980s through today.[115]

[1] Joseph Andriano, *Immortal Monster: The Mythological Evolution of the Fantastic Beast in Modern Fiction and Film* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1999) xv.
[2] Examples of the special traits appear in numerous modern forms, including the Underworld franchise, White Wolf Publishing's World of Darkness franchise, Pratchett's Discworld, and Lon Chaney Jr.'s wolf-man movies.
[3] Such as the humor surrounding the Society for the Promotion of Elfish Welfare—S.P.E.W.—started by Hermione in *Goblet of Fire* or Harry recalling "Dumbledore's idea of a few words. 'nitwit,' 'oddment,' 'blubber,' and 'tweak'" during Dumbledore's funeral (Half-Blood 644).
[4] Andriano. xi.
[5] M. Kratz, "*Fictus Lupus*: The Werewolf in Christian Thought," *Classical Folia* 30.1 (1976): 58.
[6] Heather Arden and Kathryn Lorenz, "The Harry Potter Stories and French Arthurian Romance," *Arthuriana* 13.2 (2003): 58-9.
[7] Andriano. xi.
[8] Adam Douglas, *The Beast Within: A History of the Werewolf* (New York: Avon, 1992) 111.
[9] Hereafter referred to as *Prisoner of Azkaban* (Azkaban). The rest will be referred to as *Sorcerer's Stone*, *Chamber of Secrets* (Chamber), *Goblet of Fire* (Goblet), *Order of the Phoenix* (Phoenix), *Half-Blood Prince*, and *Deathly Hallows*.
[10] Since this aspect of Greyback's character comes late in the books, he could be read as her take on real world terrorism. He could also be taken as a commentary on abused children also becoming abusers, although this claim would require a greater knowledge of his background than Rowling provides.
[11] Save only at the initial discussion of Hogwarts uniforms, Quidditch uniforms (also quite vague), and the dress robes used during both *Goblet of Fire*'s Yule Ball and Bill and Fleur's wedding in *Deathly Hallows*.
[12] Even compared to other authors writing for the target age range with similarly aged characters such as Judy Blume, her later books are exceptionally tame in this regard. Admittedly, this is not terribly important to her focal plot, although that does not stop her on other aspects/issues.
[13] Arden. 58.
[14] J. K. Rowling, *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince* (New York: Scholastic, 2005) 334-5.
[15] Interestingly, as with his transformations, this final transformation from life to death happens off-screen for both Lupin and Tonks. The reader only knows that their deaths have happened when Harry recognizes their bodies laid out with the other dead and injured characters.
[16] J. K. Rowling, *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban* (New York: Scholastic, 1999) 350.
[17] I use the phrase "target readers" or "target audience" to refer specifically to the children's/YA audience that Rowling wrote the books for, as opposed to the older readers who have also become significant fans of the series.
[18] Caroline Walker Bynum, *Metamorphosis and Identity* (New York: Zone, 2001) 188.
[19] These are two different things: Black being an animagus capable of turning into a dog of his own free will and whenever he chooses versus Lupin who is forced to turn into a wolf and had the ability/curse thrust upon him. Rowling treats them as two very different beings.
[20] Interestingly, the epilogue is also a point of transition in which most of Harry and Ginny's children (along with Ron and Hermione's and Draco's) are getting on the train to Hogwarts, some of them for the first time.
[21] J. K. Rowling, *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone* (New York: Scholastic, 1998) 249.
[22] J. K. Rowling, *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* (New York: Scholastic, 1999) 269.

[23] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 353.
[24] *Half-Blood Prince*. 334-5.
[25] J. K. Rowling, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* (New York: Scholastic, 2007) 447.
[26] Sabine Baring-Gould, *The Book of Werewolves* (New York: Causeway, 1973) 89.
[27] Given that Lupin was born circa 1960, since he was in James Potter's class and Potter was born in 1960, and Greyback first appears in 1997, Greyback must have been living as a werewolf for at least twenty-seven years—since 1970, the year before Lupin would have arrived at Hogwarts.
[28] *Half-Blood Prince*. 598.
[29] *Deathly Hallows*. 450.
[30] This appearance can be juxtaposed to the equally monstrous Voldemort in his younger, dapper, appearance and the well groomed Malfoy family, though the latter merely play at being monstrous.
[31] *Deathly Hallows*. 447.
[32] Newt Scamander, *Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them* (New York: Levine-Scholastic, 2001) 41-2.
[33] *Chamber of Secrets*. 162.
[34] Assuming that the point of the spell is to force shape-changers of any type back into their human shape, thus "homorphous."
[35] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 172.
[36] To which Lupin's laughing response is "One: He's sitting on my chair. Two: He's wearing my clothes. Three: His name's Remus Lupin . . ." (643).
[37] J. K. Rowling, *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* (New York: Scholastic, 2003) 643.
[38] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 352.
[39] Ibid. 352-3.
[40] *Chamber of Secrets*. 311.
[41] *Deathly Hallows*. 646.
[42] *Order of the Phoenix*. 170.
[43] Baldesar Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. George Bull (New York: Penguin, 1976) 42.
[44] Ibid. 109.
[45] Clearly, though, the examples of Dudley Dursley and Draco Malfoy are intended to remind us that children are not entirely innocent.
[46] *Deathly Hallows*. 213.
[47] The most notable of which occurs in Laurel K. Hamilton's work.
[48] Crystal L. O'Leary, "Transcending Monstrous Flesh: A Revision of the Hero's Mythic Quest," *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 13.3 (2003): 240.
[49] O'Leary. 241.
[50] Asa Simon Mittman, "The Other Close at Hand: Gerald of Wales and the 'Marvels of the West,'" *The Monstrous Middle Ages*, eds. Bettina Bildhauer and Robert Mills (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003) 107-8.
[51] *Order of the Phoenix*. 302.
[52] *Half-Blood Prince*. 334.
[53] Notably Sarah E. Maier and Steve Barfield in Cynthia Hallet's *Scholarly Studies in Harry Potter*, both of whom touch on issues of race in the series, but only with regard to Muggle-borns, house elves, and giants. Julia Eccleshare is equally brief in *A Guide to the Harry Potter Novels*, discussing the issue, but only with Muggle-wizard relations. The same is true of Suman Gupta,

who is interested in class and slavery issues, but only in relation to house-elves and the wizard-Muggle dynamic.
[54] Andriano. xv.
[55] *Sorcerer's Stone*. 220.
[56] Ibid. 263.
[57] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 173.
[58] Ibid. 141.
[59] As opposed to the overt racism he displays in *Chamber* through repeated use of the derogatory and highly insulting term "mudblood."
[60] Elaine Ostry, "Accepting Mudbloods: The Ambivalent Social Vision of J. K. Rowling's Fairy Tales," *Reading Harry Potter: Critical Essays*, ed. Giselle Liza Anatol (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003) 95.
[61] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 346.
[62] Hermione merely exclaims "*he's a werewolf*!" while Ron gasps "*Get away from me, werewolf!*" (Azkaban 345).
[63] Ibid. 359.
[64] Ibid. 361.
[65] Ibid. 423.
[66] *Goblet of Fire*. 434.
[67] *Order of the Phoenix*. 170-1.
[68] Ibid. 107.
[69] Karin E. Westman, "Specters of Thatcherism: Contemporary British Culture in J. K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series," *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*, ed. Lana A. Whited (Columbia, MS: University of Missouri Press, 2002) 323.
[70] *Order of the Phoenix*. 488.
[71] Ibid. 243.
[72] Ibid. 302.
[73] If Hagrid and Fleur Delacour are good examples, half-giants and part-Veelas would have a difficult time completely blending in.
[74] Ostry. 95.
[75] Westman. 306.
[76] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 352.
[77] The two potential problems for this assertion are brief moments in which Voldemort refers to werewolf cubs (Azkaban 311 and Deathly Hallows 10). That said, he is hardly reliable source of information. Even the birth of Ted Lupin does not help, since he is described as only half-werewolf—a half half-breed—whose mother is a metamorphmagus able to change her appearance at will and he does not display any wolf-ish characteristics.
[78] M. Katherine Grimes and Lana A. Whited, "What Would Harry Do? J. K. Rowling and Lawrence Kohlberg's Theories of Moral Development," *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*, ed. Lana A. Whited (Columbia, MS: University of Missouri Press, 2002) 205.
[79] Westman. 323.
[80] Unfortunately, she also gets bogged down in, mistakenly, criticizing a perceived lack of non-British ethnic/racial diversity from the Patils, Cho Chang, Dean Thomas, Lee Jordan, and Angelina Johnson, ignoring the fact that, while they come from different immigrant communities, they are all ethnically British and that racial issues in the British Isles are not identical to those in the U.S.

[81] *Half-Blood Prince*. 624.
[82] HPWiki. "Remus Lupin." 30 August 2007. 10 September 2007. http://harrypotterwiki.org/wiki/index.php/Remus_Lupin
[83] Some of these, from *Half-Blood Prince*, include "there is no cure for werewolf bites" (613), "We really don't know what the effects will be – I mean, Greyback being a werewolf, but not transformed at the time" (612), and "It is an odd case, possibly unique" (622).
[84] Grimes and Whited. 203.
[85] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 138.
[86] Ellen J. Goldner, "Monstrous Body, Tortured Soul: *Frankenstein* at the Juncture between Discourses," *Genealogy & Literature*, ed. Lee Quinby (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995) 31.
[87] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 247.
[88] *Deathly Hallows*. 213.
[89] *Order of the Phoenix*. 94.
[90] Roni Natov, "Harry Potter and the Extraordinariness of the Ordinary," *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*, ed. Lana A. Whited (Columbia, MS: University of Missouri Press, 2002) 136.
[91] C. S. Lewis, *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe* (New York: Scholastic, 1987) 76.
[92] Natov. 136.
[93] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 354.
[94] Ibid. 157.
[95] *Half-Blood Prince*. 335.
[96] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 356.
[97] *Half-Blood Prince*. 335.
[98] *Deathly Hallows*. 139.
[99] The other three layers being her focus on: 1) the relationship between Harry, Hermione, and Ron, 2) Harry's relationships with his surrogate family and secondary character friends, such as Hagrid, Luna Lovegood, Neville Longbottom, Ron's siblings, and the Gryffindor Quidditch team, and 3) Dumbledore's continued references to Voldemort's friendless state throughout *Half-Blood Prince*.
[100] He lacks respect for Snape, at least, up until the end of *Deathly Hallows*. There is no evidence that he ever holds any real respect for Slughorn or Lockhart.
[101] Terri Doughty, "Locating Harry Potter in the 'Boy's Book' Market," *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*, ed. Lana A. Whited (Columbia, MS: University of Missouri Press, 2002) 252.
[102] *Half-Blood Prince*. 614.
[103] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 429.
[104] Chantel Lavoie, "Safe as Houses: Sorting and School Houses at Hogwarts," *Reading Harry Potter: Critical Essays*, ed. Giselle Liza Anatol (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003) 43.
[105] *Half-Blood Prince*. 105.
[106] *Order of the Phoenix*. 507.
[107] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 386.
[108] *Half-Blood Prince*. 333.
[109] *Deathly Hallows*. 441.
[110] *Order of the Phoenix*. 90.
[111] Ibid. 170.

[112] Giselle Liza Anatol, "The Fallen Empire: Exploring Ethnic Otherness in the World of Harry Potter," *Reading Harry Potter: Critical Essays*, ed. Giselle Liza Anatol (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003) 178fn.
[113] *Prisoner of Azkaban*. 141.
[114] Ibid. 141.
[115] For example, Michael J. Fox's *Teen Wolf* or Laurel K. Hamilton's Anita Blake novels (which also include a variety of non-wolf werebeings).

# AFTERWORD

## Final Thoughts

Humans need fantasy to be human. To be the place where
the falling angel meets the rising ape. (Pratchett, 1999)[1]

### Our Story Thus Far

The werewolf, and the shape-shifter archetype in general, clearly plays a complex role in the Western literary and cultural traditions from its earliest Graeco-Roman roots to modern genre fiction. While the werewolf generally appears as a side figure, both the shape-shifter and the werewolf command attention as important mentors or social police and as marginal figures. Certainly the core characters present in *William of Palerne*, Pratchett's Discworld,[2] and Rowling's fictionalized England are important both as an impetus for the story and in themselves. However, the marginal characters, at least those

who continuously reappear and have speaking parts, are no less important in what they show the audience or say on behalf of the author. In the case of *William of Palerne*, the story would, as has been shown, end prematurely without the marginal character, who shows himself to actually be the central character, even though the romance was named for William.

Because of its traits and role, the shape-shifter archetype is divorced from Jung's trickster archetype. Especially in the form of the werewolf, the shape-shifter removes itself far enough to be considered an archetype unto itself, independent of, or rather interdependent with, the trickster. While there are numerous werewolves and shape-shifters that clearly represent Jung's trickster—Alphouns with his leap-scream-run routine, for instance, or Lupin in his relationship with Black and James Potter—there are many for whom the trickster is merely one of many aspects to their character, or in whom the trickster is effectively non-existent. Thus, the shifter stands on its own, as has been demonstrated, through its representation in the werewolf.

Charting the werewolf as a representative of the archetype required us to also chart the tradition of literary and cultural werewolves stretching back to at least the Romans, possibly even to the ancient Hellenes. Modern scholars, and general readers, can look back and see recognizable elements of Rowling's Lupin, Pratchett's Angua, and other modern werewolves in Petronius' soldier and Ovid's Lycaon. Likewise, the influence of Marie de France, Gerald of Wales, and other medieval writers can clearly be seen in their modern descendants as the traditions and the archetype are exhumed, dusted off, and polished to be presented to the modern audience. We also see that while the

figure went into a remission, of sorts, it remained present in the literary-cultural landscape by being concealed in the form of theatrically presented madness. The archetype manifests itself with a related purpose in later fairy tales presented to younger audiences, in which the werewolf and shifter lurk just beneath the surface. When the time once again became ripe, during the transition into the modern era, the werewolf returned openly through the horror genre, initially, only to be adopted within the fantasy genre, in children's, young adult, and adult formats. The morphological indeterminacy of the figure enhanced its evolution during this transition. I use the term "evolution" in this context in its biological sense, involving adaptation to a changing environment, rather than in a necessarily improvement focused form. That is to say, rather than implying that Pratchett's werewolves, for example, are in some way better than Ovid's, or that Pratchett is a better writer, I intend the sense that Pratchett's werewolves are adapted to a modern audience. In that respect, we can safely say that a first-century B.C.E. Roman audience would respond better to Ovid's Lycaon than to Pratchett's Wolfgang, though they would probably recognize the similarities between the two. However, the figure could not remain unchanged, unevolved, after passing through a period in which it was considered in a sympathetic light, another in which associations with witchcraft and madness effected their own changes, and its acquaintance with horror film/fiction. And the evolution has not always been especially positive, as evidenced by the aforementioned 1980s parodic-slapstick movies.

The sheer pervasiveness of the werewolf and shape-shifter archetype in the modern era speaks to their continued popularity and psychological importance. Due to

this widespread popularity and psychological role, academics ought to be investigating the werewolf and shape-shifter, as they would with Shakespeare or the trickster, in attempts to determine how they work and why they have endured over the course of more than twenty-one centuries.[3] This work has demonstrated that the figure remains popular not only for the reasons that most monsters are popular–transgressions of social conventions or being simultaneously fear inspiring and intriguing, among others–but also because of its connection with the wild, animal world that is, despite our technological and social advances, still a part of our psyche and genetic being. This connection combined with a long tradition maintains the shape-shifter archetype. Because of the tradition, one with which most people are at least subconsciously familiar, readers, moviegoers, and other audiences recognize certain elements of the archetype and respond to it. This same familiarity breeds a sense of interest and puzzlement in the audience when we see a writer subvert or build upon the tradition, adding something that we were not expecting, or reversing our expectations. The werewolf has proven exceptionally useful in this regard, as Marie de France demonstrated nearly nine centuries ago when she subverted her audience's expectations about a ravening werewolf by displaying a sympathetic one. Modern generations fed a diet of werewolf lore from horror movies/novels and folklore respond in much the same way when confronted with a sympathetic werewolf or non-horror action werewolf, or any shape-shifter for that matter. This particular study represents the smallest tip of the iceberg that is manifestations of the archetype in the literary and cultural studies fields. Hundreds of modern authors have been necessarily passed over in favor of the two chosen for this work.

As with any such study, or sense of cross-fertilizations over stretches of time and differences in cultures, the lessons that can be acquired often involve tension, contortion, and defensive or camouflaging comedy. Moreover, when we see clear moral preaching, we need to look beneath the surface, first to evaluate the overt message and second to determine what covert messages wait to be discovered. While the bridging effect is certainly an important focus of this study, we should not forget or dismiss modern adaptations and expansions, since that is where the application of literary studies to the primary (physical) world occur. In many cases, both aspects speak to the creative processes that appear to be an integral part of human nature as represented in the shape-shifter/werewolf archetype, that also link us to certain species of animals.[4]

## Future Work

While I have endeavored to be fairly representative in this particular survey and analysis, there is still much that can and should be done with the shape-shifter archetype and the werewolf. Because the figure is incredibly pervasive—with shape-shifter tales appearing in virtually every known human culture and werewolves appearing in many different cultures–any study is necessarily limited, thus leaving room for further work in several different fields. Investigations can be expanded into directions as diverse as other modern novels, television, music, and film. Future studies can, and ought to, test the

theory and archetype by including non-werewolf subjects such as human-to-human transformations (including Malory's Merlyn, Spenser's Archimago, and technological metamorphoses in modern science fiction), the wide variety of other human-animal transformations (such as Rowling's animagi or Tolkien's Beornings), or other modern authors (Charles de Lint or Tanith Lee, for example).

The study of these figures should be expanded into the realms of television and film due in part to the resurgence of werewolves and shape-shifting in both areas. Excellent television examples include the metamorphic security chief Odo in *Star Trek: Deep Space 9*, technological means of shapechanging displayed in the *Babylon 5* telefilms, and the various shape-shifters present in *Buffy*. The *Star Trek* franchise, as a long standing focus of academic research, is, perhaps, a good starting point while the current spate of research on the *Buffy/Angel* series lends itself to such a survey. We can see similar examples in the movie industry from the interest in werewolves displayed by the *Underworld* franchise and *Van Helsing* to the amorphous shapechanging villains in the *Terminator* franchise. The werewolf and shape-shifter have even insinuated themselves into late-twentieth century music, such as Warren Zevon's "Werewolves of London" and Metallica's "Of Wolf and Man"–the latter of which musically/lyrically explores the human-animal divide, or lack thereof.

This pervasiveness is one reason I contend that the shape-shifter is an archetype unto itself, most commonly represented by the werewolf. The fact that this figure has insinuated itself into so many aspects of our entertainment and instructional media calls for greater academic study in its modern iterations. Earlier appearances are being and

have been discussed in fair to great detail, notably the medieval werewolf.[5] Later forms have largely been ignored or relegated to brief references in larger works covering a particular author, such as Rowling, with a few exceptions including Lillian Heldreth's "Tanith Lee's Werewolves Within: Reversals of Gothic Traditions" (1989) and Charlotte Otten's *The Literary Werewolf : An Anthology* and *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*. Both of Otten's works, though, only provide primary sources, which are helpful, but do not include secondary criticism. Much of the critical work currently published on modern manifestations of the archetype and werewolf are non-academic in nature and take the form of semi-researched encyclopedias (such as Brad Steiger's *The Werewolf Book: The Encyclopedia of Shape-Shifting Beings*)[6] or mere lists of books with brief plot summaries (such as Frost's *The Essential Guide to Werewolf Literature*).[7] Even these focus almost entirely on the werewolf, leaving other manifestations either afterthoughts or non-existent. Since these figures are so pervasive that they appear throughout our society and since they continue to fascinate us after anywhere from 2,100 to 77,000 years, they clearly have great psychological importance to us as a species and a culture. Because of this implied importance, we need to explore their roots, current manifestations, and functions in greater detail.

[1] Terry Pratchett, *Hogfather* (New York: HarperPrism, 1999) 336.
[2] A few dozen main characters in his case from Vimes and the Watch as a whole to Granny Weatherwax and the witches to Rincewind and Cohen the Barbarian.
[3] Some sources place the earliest shape-shifter beliefs at around 75,000 or 6,000 B.C.E. while werewolves may go back as far as Gilgamesh (c. 2000 B.C.E.). See Adam Douglas, *The Beast Within: A History of the Werewolf* (New York: Avon, 1992).
[4] We can argue that dolphins, otters, and non-human primates, among others, also practice creativity in their games. But I will leave that discussion to animal behaviorists.
[5] Most recently in a Research Group on Manuscript Evidence sponsored session at the 43rd International Congress on Medieval Studies (2008) entitled "Bark at the Rune: Transforming the Medieval Werewolf."
[6] Brad Steiger, *The Werewolf Book: The Encyclopedia of Shape-Shifting Beings* (Detroit: Visible Ink Press, 1999).
[7] Brian J. Frost, *The Essential Guide to Werewolf Literature* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2003).

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Primary Sources

### Medieval


Albert the Great. *Man and the Beasts (De animalibus, books 22-26).* Trans. James J. Scanlan. Binghampton, N.Y.: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1987.

Augustine, St. *The City of God*. Trans. Marcus Dods. New York: Modern Library, 1993.

Gerald of Wales. *The History and Topography of Ireland*. Trans. John J. O'Meara. New York: Penguin, 1988.

Marie de France. *Bisclavret. The Lais of Marie de France*. Trans. Robert Hanning and Joan Ferrante. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002.

Milne, Frank A. trans. "Arthur and Gorlagon." *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*. Ed. Charlotte F. Otten. New York: Dorset Press, 1989. 234-55.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Trans. Rolfe Humphries. Indiana UP, 1983.

*The Oxford Annotated Bible.* Ed. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger. New York: Oxford UP, 1962.

Pausanias. *The Description of Greece.* n.t. London: Richard Priestly, 1824.

Skeat, Walter W. Ed. *The Romance of William of Palerne*. London: Elibron Classics,

2005.

Virgil. "Eclogue VIII." *Eclogues*. Trans. H. R. Fairclough. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard UP, 1916.

**Early Modern**

Anon. *A True Discourse. Declaring the Damnable Life and Death of One Stubbe Peeter, a Most Wicked Sorcerer*. London, 1590.

Bayfield, Robert. *Της Ιατρικης Καρτοσ or A Treatise De Morborum Capitis Essentiis & Prognosticis.* London, 1663.

Blount, Thomas. *Glossographia: Or a Dictionary, Interpreting all Such Hard Words of Whatsoever Language, Now Used in Our Refined English Tongue; With Etymologies, Definitions, and Historical Observations on the Same.* London, 1661.

Boguet, Henri. "Of the Metamorphosis of Men into Beasts." *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*. Ed. Charlotte Otten. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986. 77-90.

Brinley, John. *A Discovery of the Impostures of Witches and Astrologers.* London, 1680.

Burton, Robert. *Diseases of the Mind.* London, 1621.

Castiglione, Baldesar. *The Book of the Courtier*. Trans. George Bull. New York: Penguin, 1976.

Deacon, John & John Walker. *Dialogicall Discourses of Spirits and Divels*. London, 1601.

Ford, John. *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*. Ed. Derek Roper. London: Harper & Row, 1975.

Goulart, Simon. "Admirable Histories." *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*. Ed. Charlotte Otten. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986. 41-4.

Havers, G. trans. *A General Collection of Discourses of the Virtuosi of France Upon Questions of all Sorts of Philosophy, and Other Natural Knowledge.* London, 1664.

James I. "Men-Woolfes." *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*. Ed. Charlotte Otten. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986. 127-8.

Kramer, Heinrich and James Sprenger. "The Malleus Maleficarum (excerpt)." A *Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*. Ed. Charlotte Otten. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986. 106-114.

Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince*. Trans. George Bull. New York: Penguin, 1999.

Perrault, Charles. "Little Red Riding Hood." *Perrault's Complete Fairy Tales*. Trans. A. E. Johnson. New York: Puffin Books, 1999. 66-69.

Scot, Reginald. *The Discoverie of Witchcraft.* London, 1584.

Shakespeare, William. *Titus Andronicus 1594*. The Malone Society. Oxford UP, 2003.

Webster, John. *The Duchess of Malfi and Other Plays*. Oxford UP, 1998.

**Modern**

Clement, Hal. *Cycle of Fire*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1981.

Pratchett, Terry. *The Fifth Elephant*. New York: HarperTorch, 2001.

---. *Thud!* New York: HarperCollins, 2005.

Rowling, J. K. (writing as Newt Scamander). *Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them*. New York: Scholastic, 2001.

---. *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. New York: Scholastic, 1999.

---. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. New York: Scholastic, 2007.

---. *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. New York: Scholastic, 2000.

---. *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. New York: Scholastic, 2005.

---. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. New York: Scholastic, 2003.

---. *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. New York: Scholastic, 1999.

---. *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone*. New York: Scholastic, 1998.

Scamander, Newt. (see Rowling). *Fantastic Beasts and Where to Find Them*. New York: Scholastic, 2001.

Williamson, Jack. *Darker Than You Think*. New York: Berkley Medallion Books, 1969.

## Secondary Sources

### Medieval

Bailey, H.W. "*Bisclavret* in Marie de France." *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 1 (1981). 95-97.

Benkov, Edith. "The Naked Beast: Clothing and Humanity in Bisclavret." *Chimeres* 19.2 (1998): 27-43.

Bildhauer, Bettina and Robert Mills, Eds. *The Monstrous Middle Ages.* Toronto:

University of Toronto Press, 2003.

Bouchard, Constance Brittain. *"Strong of Body, Brave and Noble": Chivalry and Society in Medieval France*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998.

Bruckner, Matilda Tomaryn. "Of Men and Beasts in *Bisclavret*." *Romantic Review* 82.3 (1991): 251-269.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?" *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*. Ed. Caroline Walker Bynum. Berkeley: U. of California P, 1982. 82-109.

---. *Metamorphosis and Identity*. New York: Zone, 2001.

Carey, John. "Werewolves in Medieval Ireland." *Cambrian Celtic Medieval Studies* 44 (Winter 2002): 37-72.

Daston, Lorraine and Katherine Park. *Wonders and the Order of Nature, 1150-1750*. New York: Zone, 1998.

Daugherty, Evelyn N. "The Cupid-Psyche Myth in *Lanval, Graelent, Guingamor,* and *Bisclavret*." *Thoth* 16 (1976): 15-24.

Dunn, Charles W. *The Foundling and the Werwolf: a Literary Historical Study of Guillaume de Palerne*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 1960.

Dunton-Downer, Leslie. "Wolf Man." *Becoming Male in the Middle Ages*. Eds. Jeffrey J. Cohen and Bonnie Wheeler. New York: Garland, 2000.

Flores, Nona C., Ed. *Animals in the Middle Ages*. New York : Routledge, 1996.

Freeman, Michelle. "Dual Natures and Subverted Glosses: Marie de France's 'Bisclavret.'" *Romance Notes* 25 (Spring 1985): 288-301.

Friedman, John Block. *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1981.

Hess, Erika E. *Literary Hybrids: Cross-dressing, Shapeshifting, and Indeterminacy in Medieval and Modern French Narrative*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Holton, Kathryn. "Metamorphosis and Language in the Lay of Bisclavret." *In Quest of Marie de France, a Twelfth-Century Poet*. Ed. Chantal E. Maréchal. Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1992.

Jorgensen, Jean. "The Lycanthropy Metaphor in Marie de France's *Bisclavret*." *Selecta: Journal of the PNCFL*. (1994): 24-30.

Karkov, Catherine. "Tales of the Ancients: Colonial Werewolves and the Mapping of Postcolonial Ireland." *Postcolonial Moves: Medieval Through Modern*. Eds. Patricia Clare Ingham and Michelle R. Warren. New York: Macmillan, 2003. 93-109.

Knight, Rhonda. "Werewolves, Monsters, and Miracles: Representing Colonial Fantasies in Gerald of Wales's Topographia Hibernica." *Studies in Iconography* 22 (2001): 55-86.

Krappe, A. Haggerty. "Arthur and Gorlagon." *Speculum* 8 (April 1933): 209-222.

Kratz, M. "*Fictus Lupus*: The Werewolf in Christian Thought." *Classical Folia* 30.1 (1976): 57-80.

Lacy, Norris J. *The New Arthurian Encyclopedia*. New York: Garland, 1996.

Massey, Jeffry A. "*Corpus Lupi*: The Medieval Werewolf and Popular Theology." Diss. Emory U, 2003.

Mittman, Asa Simon. "The Other Close at Hand: Gerald of Wales and the 'Marvels of the West.'" *The Monstrous Middle Ages*. Eds. Bettina Bildhauer & Robert Mills. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003. 97-112.

Pappa, Joseph. "The Bewildering Bounded/Bounding Bisclavret, or Lycanthropy, Lieges, and a Lotta Leeway in Marie de France." *Crossings* 4 (2000): 117-143.

Salisbury, Joyce E. *The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Sayers, William. "*Bisclavret* in Marie de France: a Reply." *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 4 (1982). 77-82.

Shea, Kerry. "Male Bonding, Female Body: The Absenting of Woman in Bisclaretz." *Cold Counsel: Women in Old Norse Literature and Mythology*. Ed. Sarah M. Anderson. New York: Routledge, 2000. 245-259.

Williams, David. *Deformed Discourse: The Function of the Monster in Mediaeval Thought and Literature*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's UP, 1999.

**Early Modern**

Ankarloo, Bengt & Gustav Henningsen, Eds. *Early Modern European Witchcraft: Centres and Peripheries*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

Bate, Jonathan. *Shakespeare and Ovid*. New York: Oxford UP, 1993.

Bottigheimer, Ruth. "Fairy Tales and Children's Literature: A Feminist's Perspective." *Teaching Children's Literature*. Ed. Glenn Edward Sadler. New York: MLA, 1992.

Briggs, Robin. "Dangerous Spirits: Shapeshifting, Apparitions, and Fantasy in Lorraine Witchcraft Trials." *Werewolves, Witches, and Wandering Spirits: Traditional Belief & Folklore in Early Modern Europe*. Ed. Kathryn A. Edwards. Kirksville, MS: Truman State UP, 2002. 1-24.

Davidson, Jane P. "Wolves, Witches, and Werewolves: Lycanthropy and Witchcraft from 1423-1700." *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 2.4/8 (1990): 47-68.

Edwards, Katherine A. "Introduction: Expanding the Analysis of Traditional Belief." *Werewolves, Witches, and Wandering Spirits: Traditional Belief and Folklore in Early Modern Europe*. Ed. Kathryn A. Edwards. Kirksville, MO: Truman State UP, 2002. vii-xxii.

Enterline, Lynn. "'Hairy on the In-side': *The Duchess of Malfi* and the Body of Lycanthropy." *The Yale Journal of Criticism*. 7.2 (1994): 85-129.

Fudge, Erica. *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture*. New York: St. Martin's, 2000.

Goldner, Ellen J. "Monstrous Body, Tortured Soul: *Frankenstein* at the Juncture between Discourses." *Genealogy & Literature.* Ed. Lee Quinby. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995. 28-47.

Hirsh, Brett. "An Italian Werewolf in London: Lycanthropy and *The Duchess of Malfi*." *Early Modern Literary Studies*. 11.2 (September 2005): 1-43.

Jacques-Lefevre, Nicole. "Such an Impure, Cruel, and Savage Beast: Images of the Werewolf in Demonological Works." *Werewolves, Witches, and Wandering Spirits: Traditional Belief and Folklore in Early Modern Europe*. Ed. Kathryn A.

Edwards. Kirksville, MO: Truman State UP, 2002. 181-195.

Jeanneret, Michel. *Perpetual Motion: Transforming Shapes in the Renaissance from da Vinci to Montaigne.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001.

Johnson, Sharon P. "The Toleration and Erotization of Rape: Interpreting Charles Perrault's 'Le Petit Chaperon Rouge' within Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century French Jurisprudence." *Women's Studies*. 32 (2003): 325-352.

Kerbelytê, Bronislava. "Why the Literary Interpretation of a Tale is Not Popular?: Little Red Riding Hood." *Folklore* 34: 31-38.

Lamb, John B. "Mary Shelly's *Frankenstein* and Milton's Monstrous Myth." *Nineteenth Century Literature.* 47.3 (December 1992): 303-319.

Lehmann, Courtney & Bryan Reynolds. "Awakening the Werewolf Within: Self-help, Vanishing Mediation, and Transversality in *The Duchess of Malfi*." *Transversal Enterprises in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: Fugitive Explorations*. Ed. Bryan Reynolds. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006. 227-239.

Madar, Maia. "Estonia I: Werewolves and Poisoners." Eds. Bengt Ankarloo & Gustav Henningsen. *Early Modern European Witchcraft: Centres and Peripheries*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990. 257-272.

Maslen, R. W. "Myths Exploited: The Metamorphoses of Ovid in Early Elizabethan England." *Shakespeare's Ovid*. Ed. A. B. Taylor. Cambridge UP, 2000. 15-30.

Smith, Norman R. "Portentious Births and the Monstrous Imagination in Renaissance Culture." *Marvels, Monsters, and Miracles: Studies in the Medieval and Early*

*Modern Imagination*. Eds. Timothy S. Jones & David A Sprunger. Medieval Institute Publications, 2002. 267-283.

Razovsky, Helaine. "Popular Hermeneutics: Monstrous Children in English Renaissance Broadside Ballads." *Early Modern Literary Studies*. 2.3 (December 1996): 1-34.

Richards, Jennifer "Introduction." *Early Modern Civil Discourses*. Ed. Jennifer Richards. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 1-18.

---. *Rhetoric and Courtliness in Early Modern Literature*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Roe, John. *Shakespeare and Machiavelli*. Rochester, NY : Boydell & Brewer, 2002.

Wiseman, S.J. "Hairy on the Inside: Metamorphosis and Civility in English Werewolf Texts." *Renaissance Beasts*. Ed. Erica Fudge. Urbana, IL: U of Illinois P, 2004. 50-69.

Zipes, Jack. "A Second Gaze at Little Red Riding Hood's Trials and Tribulations." *The Lion and the Unicorn* 7/8 (1983-84): 78-109.

**Modern**

Anatol, Giselle Liza. "The Fallen Empire: Exploring Ethnic Otherness in the World of Harry Potter." *Reading Harry Potter: Critical Essays*. Ed. Giselle Liza Anatol. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. 163-178.

---, Ed. *Reading Harry Potter: Critical Essays*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003

Andriano, Joseph. *Immortal Monster: The Mythological Evolution of the Fantastic Beast in Modern Fiction and Film*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1999.

Arden, Heather and Kathryn Lorenz. "The Harry Potter Stories and French Arthurian Romance." *Arthuriana* 13.2 (2003): 54-68.

Barfield, Steve. "Of Young Magicians and Growing Up: J. K. Rowling, Her Critics, and the 'Cultural Infantilism' Debate." *Scholarly Studies in Harry Potter*. Ed. Cynthia Whitney Hallett. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2006. 175-197.

Buchbinder, David. "The Orangutan in the Library: The Comfort of Strangeness in Terry Pratchett's Discworld Novels." *Youth Cultures: Texts, Images, and Identities*. Eds. Kerry Mallan and Sharyn Pearce. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. 169-182.

Cockrell, Amanda. "Where the Falling Angel Meets the Rising Ape: Terry Pratchett's Discworld." *The Hollins Critic* 43.1 (Feb. 2006): 1-11.

Doughty, Terri. "Locating Harry Potter in the 'Boy's Book' Market." *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Ed. Lana A. Whited. Columbia, MS: University of Missouri Press, 2002. 243-257.

Eccleshare, Julia. *A Guide to the Harry Potter Novels*. London: Continuum, 2002.

Grimes, M. Katherine and Lana A. Whited. "What Would Harry Do? J. K. Rowling and Lawrence Kohlberg's Theories of Moral Development." *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Ed. Lana A. Whited. Columbia, MS: University of Missouri Press, 2002. 182-208.

Gupta, Suman. *Re-Reading Harry Potter*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.

Hallett, Cynthia Whitney. *Scholarly Studies in Harry Potter*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2006.

Heldreth, Lillian. "Tanith Lee's Werewolves Within: Reversals of Gothic Traditions."

*Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 2 (Spring 1989): 15-23.

Jung, Carl G. *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*. Ed. Violet S. de Laszlo. Princeton UP, 1990.

---. *Four Archetypes*. Princeton UP, 1992.

Lavoie, Chantel. "Safe as Houses: Sorting and School Houses at Hogwarts." *Reading Harry Potter: Critical Essays*. Ed. Giselle Liza Anatol. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. 35-49.

Lewis, C. S. *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe*. New York: Scholastic, 1987.

Maier, Sarah E. "Educating Harry Potter: A Muggle's Perspective on Magic and Knowledge in the Wizard World of J. K. Rowling." *Scholarly Studies in Harry Potter*. Ed. Cynthia Whitney Hallett. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2006. 7-25.

Natov, Roni. "Harry Potter and the Extraordinariness of the Ordinary." *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Ed. Lana A. Whited. Columbia, MS: University of Missouri Press, 2002.

O'Leary, Crystal L. "Transcending Monstrous Flesh: A Revision of the Hero's Mythic Quest." *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 13.3 (2003): 239-249.

Ostry, Elaine. "Accepting Mudbloods: The Ambivalent Social Vision of J. K. Rowling's Fairy Tales." *Reading Harry Potter: Critical Essays*. Ed. Giselle Liza Anatol. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. 89-101.

Pratchett, Terry. "Imaginary Worlds, Real Stories." *Folklore* 111 (2000): 159-168.

Rutledge, Gregory E. "Science Fiction and the Black Power/Arts Movements: The

Transpositional Cosmology of Samuel R. Delany Jr." *Extrapolation* 41.2 (Summer 2000): 127-142.

Sugg, Richard P. *Jungian Literary Criticism*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 1992.

Westman, Karin E. "Specters of Thatcherism: Contemporary British Culture in J. K. Rowling's Harry Potter Series." *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Ed. Lana A. Whited. Columbia, MS: University of Missouri Press, 2002. 305-328.

Whited, Lana A. Ed. *The Ivory Tower and Harry Potter: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Columbia, MS: University of Missouri Press, 2002.

**General**

Baring-Gould, Sabine. *The Book of Werewolves*. New York: Causeway, 1973.

Barkan, Leonard. *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis & the Pursuit of Paganism*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1986.

Beal, Timothy K. *Religion and its Monsters.* New York: Routledge, 2002.

Benz, Ernst. *Man and Transformation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1972.

Cheilik, Michael. "The Werewolf." *Mythical and Fabulous Creatures: A Source Book and Research Guide*. Ed. Malcolm South. New York: Bedrick, 1988. 265-289.

Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. "Preface: In a Time of Monsters." *Monster Theory: Reading Culture.* Ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen. Minneapolis, Minn.: U of Minnesota P, 1996. vii-xiii.

---. "Monster Theory (Seven Theses)." *Monster Theory: Reading Culture.* Ed. Jeffrey

Jerome Cohen. Minneapolis, Minn.: U of Minnesota P, 1996. 3-25.

Douglas, Adam. *The Beast Within: A History of the Werewolf.* New York: Avon, 1992.

Frost, Brian J. *The Essential Guide to Werewolf Literature*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2003.

Gilmore, David. *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2003.

Graham, Elaine L. *Representations of the Post/Human: Monsters, Aliens and Others in Popular Culture*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers UP, 2002.

Hamel, Frank. *Human Animals*. London: Frederick A Stokes Co., 1915.

Hassler, Donald M. *Comic Tones in Science Fiction: The Art of Compromise with Nature*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982.

---. "Swift, Pohl, and Kornbluth: Publicists Anatomize Newness." *Political Science Fiction*. ed. Donald M. Hassler and Clyde Wilcox. University of Southern California Press, 1997. 18-25

Javitch, Daniel. "Rescuing Ovid from the Allegorizers." *Comparative Literature* 30 (1978): 97-107.

Le Guin, Ursula K. *The Language of the Night*. New York: Berkley Books, 1982.

Massey, Irving. *The Gaping Pig: Literature and Metamorphosis*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1976.

Nigg, Joseph. *The Book of Fabulous Beasts*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.

Otten, Charlotte, Ed. *The Literary Werewolf : An Anthology*. Syracuse : Syracuse UP, 2002

---, Ed. *A Lycanthropy Reader: Werewolves in Western Culture*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse UP, 1986.

Routledge, Gregory E. "Science Fiction and the Black Power/Arts Movements: The Transpositional Cosmology of Samuel R. Delany, Jr." *Extrapolation* 41.2 (Summer 2000): 127-142.

Russell, W.M.S. and Claire Russell. "The Social Biology of Werewolves." *Animals in Folklore*. Eds. J.R. Porter and W.M.S. Russell. London: Brewer, 1978. 143-182.

Smith, Kirby. "An Historical Study of the Werwolf in Literature." *PMLA* 9 (1894): 1-42.

South, Malcolm. "Introduction." *Mythical and Fabulous Creatures: A Source Book and Research Guide.* Ed. Malcolm South. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987. xix-xxix.

Summers, Montague. *The Werewolf in Lore and Legend*. Mineola, NY: Dover, 2003.

Sutherland, James. *English Literature of the Late Seventeenth Century.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Vaz de Silva, Francisco. *Metamorphosis: The Dynamics of Symbolism in European Fairy Tales*. New York: Lang, 2002.

Yolen, Jane. *Touch Magic*. Little Rock, AR: August House, 2000.